AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. V.—(XXV).—JULY, 1901.—NO. 1.

CLERGY LIFE ASSURANCE.

THE study of insurance has never been deemed an integral part of the theological curriculum. Yet it involves economic questions of material welfare in which both the interest and the duty of the clergy are concerned. While voluminous works treat of the logic of the insurance business, its various methods, and the budget of insurance laws, it must be owned that publications referring to ecclesiastical insurance are few and of meagre quality; accordingly, there is a general lack of accurate information regarding the conduct of the insurance business and its bookkeeping. The scope of this paper is to answer the question, Are we getting our due share from insurance companies? I do not propose to collate authorities on the constitutional and financial system of insurance, or to identify priests with any particular insurance company: my purpose is simply to characterize the work and the merits of a type of insurance confined to the clergy as a special class of policyholders and to the underwriting of church property. Hence I must not be understood as discriminating against sectional insurance policies.

Thanks are due to several gentlemen high placed in the management of insurance for important assistance rendered in the preparation of portions of this article.

Insurance is an important factor in the calculus of national economy. It is not an astrological fad or a "confidence" scheme. It is, in sooth, an exact science, founded, not on tuition, but on observation and statistics. As seen from an ethical point of view, insurance promotes industry, frugality, temperance, punctuality in

monetary agreements, and the commercial virtues generally. "The trade of insurance," remarks Adam Smith,[1] "gives great security to the fortunes of private people, and by dividing among a great many that loss which would ruin an individual, makes it fall light and easy upon the whole society."

Insurance in General.—Insurance or assurance is a contract between two parties, in which one of them, the insurer or underwriter, agrees in consideration of a stipulated sum, called assessment or premium, to make a certain payment upon the destruction, loss, or injury of something in which the other party has an interest. The salient feature of a contract of insurance is to grant indemnity or security against risk or peril, that is, against the happening of the event or misfortune of which danger was apprehended. Premium is the remuneration for the risk assumed. The written instrument evidencing the contract is termed the certificate or policy of insurance, and is the charter of the insured person's rights.

General principles applying to contracts made, rights acquired, or acts done relative to personal property, govern the agreements of insurance.[2] A contract of insurance is the result of a proposal or application upon the part of the insured and its acceptance by the insurer. The application consists of a schedule of questions to be answered by the prospective insured. False representations or material concealment of important facts render the contract null and void. The representations or specifications indicate the amount of risk assumed. Policies are usually a tissue of technical terms constructed by the insurance company and replete with one-sided stipulations and conditions which the insurer regards as his safeguards, but which the insured looks upon as his pitfalls, or as loopholes for the escape of the insurer from the obligations of the contract. The inexperienced find much difficulty in understanding the terms and conditions of some of these policies. Mercenary solicitors or flippant agents must be often blamed for deceitful representations and insincere interpretations made to the unwary; and extravagant commissions are usually the price which the insured victims have to pay for such imposition.

[1] *Wealth of Nations*, Part 3, art. 1.

[2] *Cf.* Bouvier, *Legal Dictionary*, tit. lex. loci.

In most, if not all, States of the Union the business of insurance is under statutory provisions and the supervision of a special department of the State, which is a sort of guardian and police of the insurance business. Many State legislatures have deprived greedy insurance companies of the enormous profits from lapsed policies by compelling them to insert non-forfeiture conditions in their policies.

All the losses paid by insurers must be paid out of premiums, or the insurance business would cease to exist. Prompt payment of premiums is necessary and quite essential to the fulfilment of reciprocal obligations. Premiums must also increase in proportion as the risk becomes greater. Underwriters often re-insure their own risk in another insurance company at a smaller premium, to prevent jeopardizing their own interests. Among the companies are secrets of their conduct not disclosed to the public, to protect themselves against their rivals or unjust competitors. Reports and circulars of some companies regarding their progress are often misleading and not trustworthy. These companies are not charitable institutions, like the *Mont-de-Piété;* they are sprung from a speculative motive, although claiming to be altruistic. They pay only what is explicitly stipulated and guaranteed, and not what is simply anticipated. Only the very simple would expect insurance companies to pay out of charity.

Insurance in Particular.—Insurance corporations are organized either upon the stock plan, where certain shareholders furnish all the capital stock, assume all the risks, and reap all the earnings by way of dividends; or upon the coöperative or mutual principle, where the insured members share equally in all risks and the surplus fund is apportioned to the insured in the reduction of premiums. The most reliable mutual insurance companies have also an emergency fund as a permanent cash reserve to guarantee their contracts and to protect them against all contingencies. This emergency or guarantee fund consists of a certain portion of the surplus or dividends, and ought to be large enough to secure policies, or to cover every dollar of the company's liabilities.

Insurance is a comparatively recent offshoot of our mercantile system, and owes its phenomenal growth to the maritime commerce following on the discovery of the New World and the first

passage made to the East Indies by way of the Cape of Good Hope. The business is Proteus-like in the world of finance. First it appeared as marine insurance, to overcome the horrors of Neptune; later on it commenced to attack Vulcan, under the shield of fire insurance; only recently it has undertaken to assail Pluto, under the cover of life or accident assurance, and Mercury, under the form of casualty insurance. Mars alone of the gods remains the threatening dragon.

Life Assurance in General.—An authority on insurance writes: "While there is nothing more uncertain than the life of an individual, there is nothing much more certain than the average length of life of a multitude of people. An actuary of a life insurance company can tell almost as accurately January 1 how many people will die among a multitude of insurable risks, as he can tell December 31 how many have died during the year. Mortality tables indicate that the number of deaths per 1,000 in one year

at the age of	25	years,	will	be	about	8
" " " "	35	"	"	"	"	9
" " " "	45	"	"	"	"	11
" " " "	50	"	"	"	"	14
" " " "	55	"	"	"	"	18
" " " "	60	"	"	"	"	27."

Life assurance is in theory an improved savings bank. A life assurance contract is, strictly speaking, not one of indemnity, because the loss of life is without an equivalent. The business of life assurance differs vastly from that of marine or fire insurance. It depends upon the combination of the following concordant items: (1) the death rate; that is, the average of the probable duration of life; (2) the rate of interest at which the premium can be invested and compounded; (3) the expense of insurance management; (4) the security and negotiability of investments; (5) unforeseen accidents.

The probable amount of premium can be inferred only from scanning the above five categoric points. Sentimental considerations disappear in the horoscope of those who seek a commodity which is in the hands of a life assurance company. Only medical examination is left to gauge the measure of one's expected term of life. There are different forms of life insurance: old-line,

natural, and assessment or fraternal. But one element is common to all, that "Divine Providence has fixed the mortal law and man has not the wit to defeat it." Still another style of life assurance is endowment insurance, where the face sum of the policy is paid in cash to the insured, if living, at the end of a stated term of years, or to the beneficiary in case of the prior death of the insured. Many of the clergy consider this a good investment, providing, as it does, against the decrepitude of age.

Regular life insurance companies that cover large territories are safe, but not economical in their expenditures. They pay enormous rents, large salaries, maintain extensive office buildings with sumptuous appointments, and spend largely on bonuses or gifts. Their solicitors, agents, and brokers receive exaggerated percentages on all premiums as commission. Some of these companies are cosmopolitan and of unmanageable proportions. These financial monsters are "go-as-you-please" in money affairs, because their enormous assets and liabilities are scattered over the civilized and uncivilized world. The amount of premiums paid into such insurance giants is vastly in excess of equity. Circulars issued by the Presbyterian Ministers' Fund describe the different methods of insurance companies scooping into the pockets of their clients to enhance their profits. Some of them are here cited in illustration.

"The dividends in life assurance companies, or the rebate on an overcharged premium, allowed by some companies, are not fixed in any amount; they are variable; they depend on many contingencies, as, for instance, the rate of interest that is realized on the assests of the company, the amount of new business written, the value of the securities of the company, the number of death losses, the item of expense in running the business of the company. . . . All values have greatly depreciated during the past few years, and are likely to go lower; interest rates are not as high now as in the past, and are tending to a still lower basis. The average rate of interest of twenty-seven companies is more than 2 per cent. lower than it was in 1874. Owing to expenditures many life insurance companies have been compelled to cut down their estimates of future accumulations, which they had promised their policyholders on soliciting their insurance, in order that they might bring their promises of surplus more nearly within the reach of their possibilities to realize them.

"Do not allow estimates of future or surplus returns, on the so-called basis of a past experience, to deceive you! Do not take a policy with loan and cash values in a company where you have to pay additional premium for same! Do not be misled by a policy that guarantees the return of all premiums in event of death. . . . It is simply insuring the premium in addition to the face of policy, and the premium

charged therefor is proportionately higher. Do not be deceived by high-sounding policies! Beware of things new and wonderful in life insurance, such as '5 per cent. gold bond' or 'indemnity bond' policies, 'debentures,' or 'consols.' There is absolutely nothing of advantage in such policies that is not paid dearly for in the higher premium charged therefor, with correspondingly heavy forfeitures. Do not take a policy with any company that does not guarantee cash, loan, paid up and extended insurance values annually in its contracts! Do not take insurance because it is cheap, *i. e.*, under some assessment contract! It is better to pay more and get what you pay for, than less and get nothing." [3]

General life assurance companies have no particular rules regulating insurance pertaining to the Catholic clergy, which do not apply to other select "risks." The clergy are considered in the same light as other insurants. Catholic priests are, as a body, a temperate and conscientious class. Although more exposed to hardships and privations than any other learned profession, they usually come from long-lived families, and are in the eyes of all reputable insurance companies excellent "risks." It is alleged that the length of life is prolonged in the case of married over unmarried people. If such a statement is reliable, it does not apply to Catholic priests. Should any difference be found to exist, it is insignificant and of no importance to companies insuring a great number of lives in general. An insurance man writes: "There was a time in the experience of life insurance companies when they would not write a Catholic clergyman at the same rate as an ordinary man, considering that his ascetic habits or mode of life were not conducive to longevity. Now, however, all good insurable risks of any given age are taken at the same rate and on the same plan. The general rate of mortality among all classes has been much decreased of late years by better sanitation in cities and improved methods of living generally." Old-line life insurance companies do not furnish statistics available for publication regarding

[3] The Presbyterian Ministers' Fund, of Philadelphia, is the oldest life assurance company doing business in the United States, having been organized January 11, 1759. It is operated on very conservative lines, and is admitted upon the same basis as the ordinary fixed-premium life insurance companies. Its business is confined to Presbyterian and Lutheran preachers; but it seems to go outside the ranks of Protestant ministers of the Gospel. Another, but not quite similar corporation, is the Ministerial Life Insurance Company of California, which has its business rewritten by the Conservative Life Insurance Company of Los Angeles, Cal. Both file their reports with the Commissioner of Insurance.

mortality among the Catholic clergy. They are afraid of either telling the truth or of losing policyholders who have great influence over certain classes of people. Priests of religious orders, as a rule, do not resort to life assurance companies, and hence a mortality table of Catholic clergy comprising the regulars is not practical. What is generally supposed in the case of Episcopalian ministers may be, with only a slight difference, assumed to apply to Catholic priests, viz., that the life of a clergyman "is not, until the middle period of life, as good for insurance for the whole term of his life as an ordinary healthy life, and afterwards that it is something better, at least for a period of some years." [4]

"If so-called old-line companies," says an experienced insurance man, "were insuring their risks at a reasonably fair cost; if the cost of insurance in these old-line companies was such as to return a reasonable profit to the companies for the capital invested and work done, and at the same time permit the companies to accumulate sufficient to discharge their constantly maturing obligations, there would be no need of fraternal societies. . . . It was because of the enormous cost of life insurance in old-line companies that fraternal societies came into existence, and they have demonstrated that life insurance can be conducted much cheaper and as successfully as the old-line companies are doing." General insurance companies look askance at fraternal societies, and endeavor to counteract their influence.

Fraternal Benefit Societies.—Fraternal benefit societies are revivals of the mediæval guilds, abolished by the Reformation under the pretence of their being superstitious foundations. They are the poor man's life assurance companies, because they furnish at a nominal price, at which it can be had, to those of moderate incomes, a simple substitute for the regular insurance. Of a philanthropic character, they differ from the ordinary life assurance corporations in their organization and management, chiefly by yielding no unnecessary gratuities and by maintaining no capital stock. High insurance policies carried by some societies have the appearance of a money-making business, stimulating the selfishness of a few individuals; but this is incompatible with the spirit of

[4] *Cf.* Fundamental By-Laws of the Corporation for the Relief of the Widows and Children of Clergymen, etc.

charity to which the fraternal organizations are pledged. These benefit societies are built on the coöperative or assessment plan. Their legal status, when incorporated, is that of incorporations, and, when not incorporated, is that of ordinary partnership or agency. The same legal principles governing the general insurance companies apply also to benefit societies, wherever the facts are analogous. Incorporated associations, in which the primary object is of a benevolent, charitable, literary, or social nature, to which a feature of mutual insurance is added, are, in some States, held to be insurance companies, not exempt from the prescribed legal deposit and other State insurance laws. The funds from which the payment of sick, accident, funeral, or death benefits and other expenses are defrayed, are derived from a per capita tax, dues, or assessments, collected from all members according to provisions of the by-laws. Many assessment societies have established a sinking fund, to be for the use of the members, to keep their policies in force in case of sickness. Loans are issued from it to worthy members in time of need, the policy being given as security. Any benefit society concerned in conducting its business on a safe and successful basis creates and maintains an emergency or a reserve fund, which is held in trust and must be invested in good securities, bonds, stocks, lien notes, or mortgages, deeds of trust, or deposited in savings banks subject to sight drafts. Should the death rate become very great in any year, the reserve should be large enough to meet all claims without having to raise the annual assessment.

The following quotation from the Massachusetts Insurance Report for 1900 serves to illustrate that organizations conducted on the assessment plan, without a reserve fund, are the most untenable and unsuccessful systems of life insurance in vogue.

"If then, say at the age of thirty, 1,000 persons propose to insure their lives for one year for $1,000 each, it is clear that, as 8 will die during the year, there must be $8,000 to be paid at the end of the year; and as of course each of the 1,000 contributed at the start an equal share, $8.00 (leaving out the slight interest effect) would be the cost to each for his year's insurance. And this process might go on year by year, each one paying year by year his proper share to the mortality requirement. At the age of forty, as in aging along the chances of life failure have increased to 10 per 1,000, the cost to each would be $10.00; at fifty, $16.00; at sixty, $30.00; at seventy, $65.00; at eighty, $140.00, and so on. . . . This plan obviously requires

a continually increasing cost as years go on, and in older ages would become very expensive and burdensome, practically prohibitory. It could only be attractive for a brief term of years, and is unsuitable for whole life. To obviate the objection of continually rising rates, a plan is employed under which the rate will remain level or equal throughout. Of course, such a scale would require a premium larger in the beginning than the natural premium or yearly term cost, in order to create a fund to offset the higher costs in later years of the natural premium over the level rate."

The average age or new-blood theory does not mend the hole. For instance, at the age of twenty years the annual cost of a premium for insuring an endowment of $1,000 is $14.00; at the age of sixty, it is $54.30, making an average of $34.15 for each of the lives; now forty is the mean age between the two, but the rate of forty is only $24.30.[5] Some fraternal societies are beginning to see the fallacy of assessment life insurance and are seeking insurance in level premium companies. Often these societies draw their members from all sorts of professions; others are of ephemeral existence, depending only upon the life of their promoter.

Many assessment societies have been organized under the auspices of the Church. The Catholic founders of these benevolent societies thought to repudiate the saying that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. Such societies, whilst encouraged by the Church, are not Church organizations or Church sodalities. A Catholic society is based on the principle expressed by St. Paul, "Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. . . . Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?"[6] The clergy take considerable interest in these fraternal societies and are usually enrolled in them. Their aim is to prevent the weak-kneed Catholic from joining and enriching forbidden lodges, secret orders, camps, or semi-secret, non-Catholic, or mixed societies. Every man should make provision for his family in case of distress or death. This wise forethought is a Christian virtue. "If any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."[7] This is not to be construed as meaning that a Catholic should make a pauper of himself, and neglect Church and home duties by joining as many insurance socie-

[5] The table of rates of the Episcopalian "Corporation for the Relief of Widows, etc.," is here used.

[6] Cor. 6: 14, 16.

[7] 2 Tim. 5: 8.

ties as possible. Although these societies are as a rule doing a good work, it is nevertheless an open question whether the insurance feature of strictly Church organizations inures to the benefit of our Church. Money is often more sensitive than the religious feeling. Darwin's "struggle for existence," "survival of the fittest," "process of natural selection," are aptly illustrated in the keen competition of our multifarious benefit societies.

Clergy Life Assurance.—Priests have a duty to make provision, during their early and productive years, adequate for the contingencies of the future, for the day of adversity and the evening of life, and for the payment of their last obligations. Even the last debt cannot take unto itself wings and fly away. Those who are careless respecting these matters thereby tarnish their name. It is true some of us never care for an independent purse, relying rather on the diocesan relief societies for the support of old age, sickness, and in the unhappy event of delinquency. But hardly any of our clergy funds satisfy the honest needs of their members. They are all too straitened by conditions and restrictions, and can yield only small benefits. Some of them are even doing positive harm to the clergy who are not incardinated into the diocese, but otherwise paying their dues. It is certain that much depends upon the good will of the Ordinary of the diocese, who is generally the whole soul of such a relief society. These and other circumstances, which need not at present be adverted to, debar many priests from joining a diocesan relief society.

Life assurance policies presented by old-line assurance corporations entail too heavy expense on those priests whose means are limited. It was at one time proposed to start a new insurance organization which would operate exclusively among the Catholic clergy of the United States. The fear of failure prevented the project from being realized. Among the various local organizations, the Roman Catholic Clerical Fund Society of the Diocese of Omaha is one that recommends itself as working upon a plan far superior to any scheme heretofore projected. It aims to afford good and reliable insurance at a cost within the reach of all. From more than a century of insurance history and experience its projectors have selected the best methods, avoiding the errors of the past, and making no pretence of trying to do the impossible.

This Society is a miscellaneous corporation, organized in conformity with the laws of the State of Nebraska in 1900. Its business offices are in Omaha. There is undoubtedly good reason for such an association and every consideration seems to warrant its growth and success. Of course, its membership is necessarily limited and it is not expected that even the whole of the clergy to whom it is confined by its charter will become members. "The liabilities to great fluctuations in the condition of an insurance company, which takes but a small number of risks, must be obvious to every person conversant with the subject."[8] Some paragraphs selected from the constitution and by-laws of the R. C. Clerical Fund Society may elucidate its plan and its working. Its object is to extend assistance to its members in case of disease, infirmity, disability, or other necessity, at such times and to such extent as may be determined by the Board of Trustees; also, to adopt means for the endowment of scholarships for students for the priesthood.

"This Society, being purely mutual, shall have no capital and no debts. Any priest of the Roman Catholic Church who contributes at least $5.00 a month to the purposes of the Society shall be considered a member. A member who has contributed $1,200 by the monthly assessments or otherwise is entitled to receive the certificate of full membership, which relieves him of any further payments or assessments in the Society. The Board of Trustees shall from time to time decide what amount shall be considered the maximum benefit, which sum will be allowed in a proper case to those holding the full certificate of membership. All other members shall be entitled only to a proportionate part of said sum, according to the amount of money paid by them to the Society. Whenever there is in the general fund money enough to warrant the insuring the life of some member on the endowment plan, the Board of Trustees will select some standard life insurance company and insure therein the life of some member for the benefit of the Society. When any policy of insurance thus procured matures, the amount thus obtained shall be immediately divided into two equal parts, one to be invested for the benefit of the Society and the other to be applied in establishing . . . scholarships."

If a member is unable to pay $5.00 a month he can make the

[8] *Cf.* Fundamental By-Laws of the Corporation for the Relief of the Widows and Children of Clergymen in the Communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with home office at Philadelphia. This charitable organization was founded in 1769. It conducts its business on a scientific basis, and issues endowment and annuitant policies. It does not report to the insurance department.

amount to be paid monthly to suit himself, as the benefits are proportionate to the amount paid to the Society; and, if he so desires, he may at any time make up the deficit of arrears to the full required amount. Once the full sum of $1,200 is paid, no more dues are required from the member. There are few priests, indeed, who cannot afford to take membership on such easy terms, involving but a small sacrifice; and membership is open to all the priests of the country. The clergy of different dioceses are divided into groups of their respective dioceses, on account of the special feature of this society to establish scholarships under the direction of the Ordinary of each diocese. The apparent drawback to the growth of this association is that those who inaugurated it cannot reap its fruits like their survivors. This is only a temporary disadvantage, however. Moreover, the small dioceses do not fare as well as the large ones in the matter of scholarships. If the four hundred and seventy-eight diocesan priests of the Archdiocese of New York should follow the Omaha plan, at the end of twenty years they would have accumulated one million dollars, the interest of which would suffice to support a considerable number of their indigent or infirm members. The plan seems at first sight to be Utopian, but an examination of it on strictly business principles will readily reveal its practical and truly beneficent character. With regard to benefits, it is true of this association as it is of other insurance societies, that the waters cannot rise above their fountain head.

At this time there is much talk of federating our Catholic societies, and it may be permitted me to suggest that Catholics should write their own insurance generally, and to recommend an insurance business of our own on the *Mont-de-Piété* plan. Not the least of the benefits that would accrue to us through such an organization would be the immense amount of money we could keep among ourselves to use for building and endowing institutions and saving the interest which they now pay out.

ANSELM KROLL.

La Crosse, Wis.

AN OLD TEXT IN A NEW GARB.

"Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier? Nondum venit hora mea."—*John, 2: 4.*

THESE words were spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ to His blessed Mother at the wedding of Cana in Galilee, and it is supposed by some that they contained a mild rebuke to Mary, as if to call her Divine Son's attention to the failing of the wine had been somewhat inopportune or out of place. But though at first sight some such disapproval would seem to attach to the sentence, we venture to say that, really, nothing of the kind was intended by our Lord, and that, far from implying even a shadow of rebuke, the meaning of the passage is an approval of Mary's conduct and an endorsement on the part of the Redeemer of the tacit petition contained in her words, "*Vinum non habent*—they have no wine."

It may be well first to remark that the phrase, "*Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?*" is the literal rendering of what, perhaps, was one of those expressions called idiomatic, such as are to be met with in every spoken language, and the meaning of which is often very different from that which the same words convey when they are not used as an idiom. But this apart, the sense which we attach to the sentence is the following, to wit: Is this, namely, the failing of the wine befitting Me and you, woman? Thus the Saviour would have expressed idiomatically, and by way of interrogation, His own mind, that it was not becoming Him or His blessed Mother that the wine should fail, or that it would not do, on His and her account, that their hosts should fall short of wine on the occasion. Whence it would follow that Mary's conduct could not be inopportune or out of place or in the least at variance with the mind of her Divine Son. She would have simply done here what God requires all to do, that is, that we ourselves lay our wants open to Him. Christ could not but know that the wine had failed, but as God deals with men after the manner of men, it was meet that the want should be laid before Him; and this is just what Mary did: "*Vinum non habent.*" Christ, upon this, replies to her: "*Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?*" as if actually expressing: This will not do, or this should not be, on My and

your account; by which He not only approves and accepts her statement, but implicitly also declares that He would comply with her tacit request and remedy the deficiency.

That this and no other was the real meaning of the answer, is made manifest by Mary's conduct; since upon the reply of her Son, and beyond doubt prompted by it, she turns to the waiters and says to them: "Whatever He shall say to you, do ye." To suppose or imagine for even a moment that Mary's words and conduct could ever be in the least at variance with the will of her Divine Son, is not only gratuitous, but also derogatory to her virtue and perfection. Now it is clear, on the one hand, that if her expostulation had been in the least inopportune or out of place, it would have been that much at variance with the fitness and perfect order of things, and consequently that much also at variance with the will of God. And if, on the other, the words of her Son had contained the merest shadow of disapproval of her course, how could she, after that, have acted as she did? Would she have continued to pursue a line which she would have now understood to be disapproved by her Son? No one will admit it. In other words, either Mary understood her Son's reply as an approval of her conduct or as a disapproval. If the former, we have our point. If the latter, then her conduct would have been at variance with the known mind of our Lord, and a serious fault on her part, a thing not even to be dreamed of, as no speck, nay, not as much as a shadow of imperfection can be allowed in her. We must, therefore, conclude that our Lord's words to her: "*Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?*" far from expressing the least rebuke and disapproval, were rather an explicit approval of her course.

To say that Mary's petition was inopportune, and that, notwithstanding this, it was accepted and granted by our Lord Jesus Christ in deference to her, and in order to manifest her power of intercession, seems to us like seeking to secure to Mary an honor at the expense of a far greater one: her intercessory power, at the expense of her perfect adherence to the will of God. The fact that the Saviour of men chose to work His first miracle through the mediation and request of His blessed Mother, is proof enough of her power with God in the economy of our

salvation. To seek to enhance her efficacy otherwise than by her perfect conformity with the will of God, is to rest the claim on ground as untenable as it is false, since it would be making Mary's action the rule of God's will, not God's will the rule of her action.

But do not the words of our Lord, "*Nondum venit hora mea*," show plainly that Mary's course had been somewhat out of place, inopportune? By no means; for these words, being connected with the preceding ones, must be interpreted in harmony with them. Now, the first part of the sentence, as we have seen, is an approval of her action; how can then "*Nondum venit hora mea* — my hour is not yet come," imply a contrary sense or disapproval? Again, then, we venture to say that these words also have a different meaning from that which is commonly attributed to them; and that, further, the kernel of the whole passage is right here in this "*Nondum venit hora mea.*"

What then does our Saviour mean by "*hora mea?*" We say it without hesitation, He means the time of His Passion, that is, the time when He was to let Himself be disgraced by holding back the power of His Divinity, that He might drink to the last dregs the chalice of humiliation and sufferings which He had chosen to endure for us. This is what He calls His time, "*hora mea;*" and with good reason He calls it so. For since He could not suffer and die except in time, having chosen to save us by His sufferings and death, He had by necessity to choose His own time in which He would suffer and die. The time of His Passion was, then, really and emphatically His time, the hour He had chosen and appointed unto Himself to suffer and lay down His life for mankind.

To show this interpretation is not arbitrary, but rests on solid ground, we need not appeal to the authority of St. Augustine, with whom "*hora mea*" stands for "*hora passionis meae;*" we have but to recall what is related of our Lord by St. John on another occasion (John 7: 30). "They sought to apprehend Him; and no man laid hands on Him." And what is the reason given why "no man laid hands on Him?" "*Quia nondum venerat hora ejus*—because His hour was not yet come," says the Evangelist. This reason is striking, and much to our purpose,

since it gives us the key to the proper understanding of the passage under discussion, "My hour is not yet come." For no one will deny that the words, "*Nondum venerat hora ejus*," have reference to the time of our Lord's Passion. May we not, therefore, conclude that "*hora mea*," in the passage before us, refers also to it? For the "*hora ejus*," in the pen of St. John, would seem to be identical with the "*hora mea*" on the lips of the Saviour. But the former refers unquestionably to the time of our Lord's Passion; therefore also the latter; and both sentences express one and the same time, the hour chosen by the Redeemer to let Himself become as a helpless being in the hands of His enemies.

In our position, then, the sense of "*Nondum venit hora mea*" would be this: My hour, the time chosen by Me to suffer, and hold back, instead of displaying My Divine power, is not yet come, and the present is the occasion decreed and set unto Myself for the first manifestation of My Divinity. Therefore, at the request of His blessed Mother, "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested His glory," as is written by the Evangelist. Thus the hour which the Saviour calls His, and which He declares is not yet come, was not the hour for Him *to do*, but *not* to do miracles. Whence follows that Mary's petition could not be inopportune, when it was not inopportune for her Divine Son to do and grant what she had asked of Him. And if so, how can His words to her be construed as if her request had been out of season or place?

This interpretation appears even more acceptable if we look a little more closely into the matter. For the wedding and attendant shortness of wine, in all the adjuncts and circumstances of the case, must be considered from a twofold point of view, to wit: as a human event; that is, an effect of secondary causes, whatever these may have been, and which, acting as such, brought about the event such as it was and as is described by the Evangelist. But whilst all this, it was also the hour and occasion foreordained and decreed by God for His only begotten Son Incarnate to work His first miracle; and this could not but be present to our Saviour's mind. Now with this before Him, how could He mean by his words, "*Nondum venit hora mea*," that

His time to work miracles was not yet come, when He, as God, had set unto Himself this very time and occasion to work the miracle which He here wrought? It would seem evident, therefore, that His words could not have such a meaning.

But if we consider, on the other hand, that while our Lord Jesus Christ had inherent in Himself by His own nature all power in Heaven and on earth to do at all time any and all miracles He might please, and that yet He chose to work out our redemption by limiting the exercise of this power to such and such occasions only, does it not follow that, if "*hora mea*" means not His time to work miracles, it must necessarily mean the time in which He chose to work no miracles? And was not this particularly the time of His sufferings and death, when He so annihilated Himself as to say by the mouth of His prophet, "*Ego sum vermis et non homo?*"

But it will be said: Did not Christ Himself qualify the time of His Passion as the hour of His enemies? Did He not say, on being apprehended by them, "*Haec est hora vestra*—This is your hour?" So He did, and with good reason, too; for it really was both His hour as well as their hour. It was His time, the time in which He chose to suffer; it was their time in which they would make Him suffer. Did He suffer any less freely because they were not hindered from their wicked purpose? Or were they any less the free and guilty instruments of His sufferings and death because He chose to be their victim? It was, then, both His and their time; but yet His first and theirs after. Nor was it any less His because also theirs; nor any less theirs because it was His first. He could, then, call it one and the other, since it was both. But whether He calls it "*Hora mea*," or "*Hora vestra*," it is one and the same time that He means, the time of His ignominious Passion and Death.

But further, according to several Fathers of the Church, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus of Turin, Epiphanius, Gregory of Naz., John Damasc., our Lord Jesus Christ had come to the wedding for the special purpose of elevating the natural contract of marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament, and the change of water into wine was intended to typify and express this elevation. To quote only St. Cyril, whose words are most explicit: "Christus ipse cum dis-

cipulis suis invitatus venit ad nuptias, non tam epulaturus, quam ut miraculum faceret, ac praeterea generationis humanae principium sanctificaret, quod ad carnem nimirum attinet" (in Joan. L. ii, c. 2). But if Christ had come to the wedding with the very object in view of working a miracle, how can it be maintained that the time for Him to do miracles had not yet come, and that such is the meaning of His words, "*Nondum venit hora mea?*"

Moreover, admitting on the authority of the Fathers mentioned above that the real object of our Lord's presence at the wedding was to raise matrimony to the dignity of a Sacrament, we have good ground to surmise that the conspicuous part taken by Mary in the event was not without mystery; whence, again, may be inferred an additional confirmation of the opinion advanced in this paper.

For it is theologically certain that Mary is the individual woman meant and spoken of in the Divine Oracle: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head" (Gen. 3: 15). God's plan for the redemption of mankind is here unfolded to us. Adam and Eve, the parent stock of the race, brought ruin upon their offspring by their joint action and rebellion, and in the design of an All-wise, Omnipotent God it was by the joint action of another man and another woman that the evil should be repaired. Since the seed of the woman could be no other than the Saviour of men, our Lord Jesus Christ, so also the woman spoken of in connection with it could be no other than she from whom the seed was to come forth. Mary, then, in the divine plan of our salvation, was to be associated with her Son—secondarily, yes; yet as a joint and true factor in the work, or, as the schoolmen say, she was to fill the function of Co-Redemptrix with Him, a function most clearly expressed and assigned to her in the words of the prophecy. In this capacity, therefore, she had to share, and take her part in whatever was foreordained that the Saviour of men should do or suffer to carry out His divine mission.

Now Christ, as we have heard from St. Cyril, had come to the wedding to fulfil one part of the programme that lay before Him: He had come to work His first miracle, and to sanctify by His presence and action the marriage contract, the union of man and woman, the very wellspring of the human family; "*Ut sanctificaret*

humanae generationis principium." Such being the case, must we not view Mary's presence and conduct on the occasion as springing from her function of Co-Redemptrix? Can we look upon her action, under all the circumstances of the event, otherwise than as her joint share and coöperation in what was so great a part of the uplifting and regeneration of man?

From this we better also understand why the Redeemer said here both *mihi* and *tibi;* and likewise why He calls Mary woman, and not mother. The failing of the wine was, beyond doubt, an untoward human incident; but yet, without ceasing to be so, it had also been foreordained as the occurrence of which Christ was to make use, "to sanctify our race from its source," beginning His work of reparation at the very fountain head of man's existence. And it is just for this that it was incongruous for Him not to remedy the deficiency of the wine. Likewise, since Mary was here, too, associated with Him in her capacity of Co-Redemptrix, not to supply the want would have been incongruous also on her account. Hence both *quid mihi et tibi;* and since, further, Mary is here taking, as a matter of fact, an active part with her Divine Son in what was really a crushing of the serpent's head, what could be more pertinent and more appropriate than to call her woman, being, as she was, not only the woman of the prophecy, but in the actual discharge, together with her seed, of her prophesied function?

We submit this view for what it is worth, and on its own merit, as we are too utterly insignificant to give it any weight by our saying so. If it be objected that the opinion is new, and therefore lacking both authority and the support of antiquity, we should remark that authorities and antiquity are not agreed on the sense of the passage. Whence follows that, as the true meaning still remains an open question, a new interpretation is not necessarily false or untenable because at variance with other and older ones. It simply would have to stand on its own merits; and so long as it is not shown to be against reason, or in conflict with any revealed truth, or any teaching of the Church, as it may not be devoid of its share of probability, it may also deserve some attention.

L. B. PALLADINO, S.J.

Missoula, Montana.

OUR COLLEGE EDUCATION FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF UTILITY.

THERE is in these days much speech-making and writing about education and the progress we are making in popularizing it. Immense numbers are sent to school, and yet it may be questioned whether or not there is any proportionate increase in the number of those who love learning or find delight in the pleasures of the mind. Education is for the most part being made a stepping-stone to the attainment of position, wealth, and celebrity, or to the paths that promise ultimately to lead thereunto. Thus education is becoming a mere purchasing commodity without a value for its own sake. Yet to the greatest minds of all ages and lands the primary advantage of education lay in this, that it opens the path to the pleasures of the mind; that learning procures a high order of enjoyment through the recognition of the beauty and the helpfulness of truth. "There is no pleasure comparable," writes Bacon, "to standing upon the vantage ground of truth." He describes it as "a hill not to be commanded, where the air is always clear and serene." And Milton utters a similar thought when he says: "I will point you out the right path of a virtuous and noble education; laborious indeed at the first ascent, but else so smooth, so green, so full of goodly prospect and melodious sounds on every side, that the harp of Orpheus was not more charming."

Now, whatever other results may be attained by the education imparted in our colleges, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that an appreciation of learning for the intellectual and moral advantages it procures is not one of the characteristic impressions left on the mind of the student. We measure efficiency by results, and we gauge results by examinations. Thus it happens in many cases that our education is simply for examinations. This is a radical error. Examinations may be necessary. But they should be regarded as means only, not as ends. Furthermore, the examinations are for the most part only tests of memory. The student is urged to reproduce not his own observations, but what others have thought and said. "A man who has thus been provided with views and acute observations may have destroyed in himself the germs of that power which he simulates. He might

have had a thought or two now and then if he had been let alone; but if he is made first to aim at a standard of thought above his years, and then finds that he can get the sort of thought he wants without thinking, he is in a fair way to be spoiled." In these cases, as Cardinal Newman says, reason acts almost as feebly and impotently as in the madman—derangement having, I believe, been considered as a loss of control over the sequence of ideas. Such persons—

"once fairly started on any subject whatever, they have no power of self-control; they passively endure the succession of impulses which are evolved out of the original exciting cause; they are passed on from one idea to another, and go steadily forward, plodding along one line of thought in spite of the amplest concessions of the hearer, or wandering from it in sudden depression in spite of his remonstrances. Now, if, as is very certain, no one would envy the madman the glow and originality of his conceptions, why must we extol the cultivation of that intellect, which is the prey, not indeed of barren fancies, but of barren facts, of random intrusions from without, though not of morbid imaginations from within? And in thus speaking I am not denying that a strong and ready memory is in itself a real treasure; I am not disparaging a well-stored mind, though it be nothing besides, provided it be sober, any more than I would despise a bookseller's shop:—it is of great value to others even when not so to the owner. Nor am I banishing,—far from it,—the possessors of deep and multifarious learning from my ideal university; they adorn it in the eyes of men; I do but say that they constitute no type of the results at which it (chiefly) aims; that it is no great gain to the intellect to have enlarged the memory at the expense of faculties which are indisputably higher. Especially those who are self-taught will be often ignorant of what everyone knows and takes for granted, of that multitude of small truths which fall upon the mind like dust impalpable and ever accumulating; they may be unable to converse; they may argue perversely; they may pride themselves on their worst paradoxes or their grossest truisms; they may be full of their own mode of viewing things, unwilling to be put out of their way, slow to enter into the minds of others; but, with these and whatever other liabilities upon their heads, they are likely to have more thought, more mind, more philosophy, more true enlargement, than those earnest but ill-used persons who are forced to load their minds with a score of subjects against an examination, who have too much on their hands to indulge themselves in thinking or investigation, who devour premises and conclusion together, with indiscriminate greediness, who hold whole sciences a faith, and commit demonstrations to memory, and who too often, as might be expected, when their period of education is passed, throw up all they have learned, in disgust, having gained nothing really by their anxious labors, except perhaps the habit of application."

There is hardly to be found a great mind that has not pointed out how knowledge is its own reward, and in itself is its chief end. That end, that reward he will make known to men as one most worthy of their best efforts, to the pleasures of which we may

rise, to be satisfied by them, to enjoy them honestly and without affectation,—pleasures which "cheer the languor and gild the barrenness of life."

Now, indeed, we work in no such way as that to which the greatest minds would guide us. To enter such a profession, to reach such a social or civil or political position: that is the aim of education. And nothing is more necessary; nothing, in its way, is more admirable. But when the utility of education is seen in such things mainly or alone, then it is diverted from its chief purpose. What confusion there is, and what hopeless confusion, in thinking that by raising whole classes up to certain *standards* so that they may pass certain examinations, we are doing the best to make nations wise and calm, and individuals strong and gentle!

Among the things left undone is the learning the distinction between education in a secondary sense and education which comes in the strength of quietness and confidence, by no expeditious, popular, and wholesale method. Everybody will admit the possible gain that accrues to the young from a knowledge of reading and writing, even if viewed only as a means of winning positions. Perhaps such training should be made compulsory. But for the real education of young men and women arrived at what used to be called "years of discretion," nothing is attained until there is shown voluntary interest in things of the mind, in and for themselves, self-effacement, and that secret union of known strength and known weakness, growing together in the shy retreats of a mind and character living a full life; recognition of power gained, together with openness and readiness to accept; quietness and confidence combined.

But let us group our thoughts round universities and colleges such as we know most of them in America. And to make application of what is said, according to our limitations and surroundings, let us compare higher and lower ideals of universities. Thus when we compare ourselves with others, we realize what we are doing, what we might do, what perhaps we ought to and in some measure can do.

It has been asserted that the function of a university is to teach and to do nothing else, and although such is no longer the general belief in America, it is still practically maintained in many places.

Education Only Begins, Even at the University.—What is essential is to act as if the university or college—we mix these things —made only a beginning in education.

The direct object of intellectual education, specially through letters, is the nourishing and strengthening of the mind, without reference, in the first instance, as to the particular forms of utility. Such education has its confessed limits. We seek to gain wisdom, justness in dispute, generosity of temper, an emancipation from worrying over small things, a power of talking not only to relate, and a total indifference to gossip, a sense of humor, and the power to see things in their real relations and true proportions. The "disciplined intellect preserves one from the blundering discourtesy of better, perhaps, but less educated minds, who, like blunt weapons, tear and hack instead of cutting clean, who mistake the point in argument, waste their strength on trifles, misconceive their adversary, and *leave* the question more involved than they find it." But this interest in things of the mind, this way of laughing almost unconsciously at absorption in the petty interests around us, this sense of power, we can but begin to get at college. How, with wider experience and with increased responsibility, our mental life seems touched by the life of a new spring, many can bear witness. It grows and expands, becomes rich and fruitful. Only, what if you have not planted? You cannot then expect the ripening season to bring the fruit. Not all the experience of life, whatever other powers it may give him, will give flexibility of mind to the man who is ignorant of what has been and is the *thought* of the human race, whose imagination is void, for whom poetry is prosaic, and who is but half conscious of the importance, in the long run, of much which is important to him or his friends or his nation. But the way of escape for his mind and spirit is open, though he never stir from his native place. He can be *free*, whether he be engaged in business or in a profession, unknown to the world at large, or famous. It is to the gravest purpose of this life that our education should be directed; there can be none more grave than what is found in the strong and balanced mind and the free and rejoicing imagination. "List, mortals, if your ears be true;" for indeed, "to him who has not the science of virtue all other knowledge is harm-

ful." Montaigne's more noble forerunner, Thomas à Kempis, is not more absolute. Yet still, what has been said above is perhaps more necessary to say to us, many of whom spring from races who once became Puritan, or who—for good or for bad in other things—have received Puritan influence. A Puritan has at least a high ideal. If he despised intellectual concerns, and killed his natural love of what was beautiful, he did these things in the interests of his soul. But a Puritan without the essential of his Puritanism finds, to use Hawthorne's words, that he has to recover the lost art of gaiety; and he has to sow the seeds of faith, faith absolute and without second thought, in the supremacy of the intellect within its own sphere. Otherwise, he has no higher interests. It is not, I believe, a mistake in judgment to say that as a consequence *success* to a de-Puritanized Puritan almost always means success in making money, and success in making provision for a more or less selfish domesticity, where the belief in the supremacy of intellect has not any meaning, and where the love of the beautiful is an affectation. That seems our special danger, speaking generally—more our danger than that of other peoples. What *their* dangers are, the parable will remind us, it is not our primary best interest to behold.

We come now to the **successful and the useful.** If we realize that success in the popular sense is not the primary object of mental training and gradual intellectual development, we shall do something to help ourselves and others in making straight the way for a wiser time, and even now shall save ourselves and others much disappointment.

Education of the mind has not *success* in this sense as its primary object any more than it has for primary object to make a man religious, or to give him a good physique. The mental education itself is the object. And the acquiring more and more of that—not merely in learning new languages—need end only with life. Of course, "just as in morals, honesty is the best policy, as being profitable in a secular aspect though such profit is not the measure of its worth, so, too, as regards what may be called the virtues of the intellect, their possession, indeed, is a substantial good, and is enough; yet still that substance has a shadow, in-

separable from it, viz., its social and political usefulness." Still, "intellectual culture is its own end; what has its *end* in itself has its *use* itself also. A healthy body is good in itself; so a healthy intellect. If a college of physicians is a useful institution because it contemplates bodily health, why is not an academic body, though it were simply and solely engaged in imparting vigor and beauty and grasp to the intellectual portion of our nature? . . . The Edinburgh reviewers (Jeffrey, Sydney Smith, etc.), in one passage, speak of a useful education as one that cultivates the understanding, gives a talent for speculation and original inquiry, and a habit of pushing things up to their first principles: this," says Newman, "is what I have called a *good* or *liberal* education."

So, universities have nothing to do *directly* with preparing men for profession; and those who ask universities so to prepare, mistake the proper functions of such bodies, unless their proper work of preparation has already been completed. Universities have been done harm to by unwise outsiders; they have been done good to by wise ones, let us add. But if they themselves become primarily training schools for professions, knowledge and mental training will be sought elsewhere, as they have been sought and found outside universities often enough before, though perhaps for other reasons.

It is certainly an excellent thing that university education should assist a man in his profession. But whether the education has this effect or not, it will have had its own *inevitable* effect, in proportion to the excellence of the training received, of the work done, and of the capacity. If any living seed has been planted, it will grow into a tree, whose increased power of bearing fruit will then be according to the measure of its cultivation, more sure than is the life-power of any tree growing before our eyes. University education may advance our interests in many ways, perhaps certainly will do so; but in that one way it *must* have done so, and must continue to do so. If men once have it, really, they cannot be defrauded of their hope. It is true, not very much can be done at college. Time has to be spent in groundwork, in teaching almost the elements of languages, the beginning of science. Still, some training can be given, and something be shown of what, through scientific law, can be

gained of sense of order and proportion, and through literature of right judgment on life, and of true taste, that "conscience of the mind." Education at a university can be a guide to further education. This is to be remembered, even though a few years later a man is surprised to find in old college work how little substance there is, how little reality, and of his real self. In fact, one will not write what is more worthy than one's self; and a time chiefly of preparation will not often produce what is of permanent interest. And so in reading. To value at that time words of a great writer is not possible without further experience of great literature and of life, without a more perfected taste. It is preposterous to expect that a great book can be understood as fully at the beginning of manhood as later. That which Milton calls "the precious life-blood of a master spirit" cannot live fully in our early life, even though already indeed it half fire the heart and brain to think such serious thoughts and to do such worthy deeds. In the following years there is no greater mental pleasure than is given by the growth in a self-confidence which is both humble and proud. Certainly it is right to have, from the first, trust in the wisdom of a great author, belief in his ready intentional truthfulness, in the instinctive fitness of his words. But the appreciation of such things cannot but be gradual; many of us know ourselves how gradual it is. As yet, knowledge is not wide enough, the mind is not trained enough, taste is not formed, and experience fails, as yet; and the character of the man will gain strength. So it is, that to place a man in the position afterwards to know the real utility which lies in education itself, he must not be expected at first to be more than guided, and given confidence in what is before him. To act otherwise is literally *preposterous*. Still, before he leaves a university, he may feel the growing delight in the knowledge of this utility, and may be more benefited than he is even conscious of. Are we ever fully conscious of the benefits—how much weariness spared ourselves and others, how much pettiness, how much folly, and how many other people less unhappy through our own wiser happiness?

It is pleasant to be made by the weight of opinion to think that a man trained in letters or in science is so far better able to learn his trade or his profession. It is more pleasant to think of him as a man, a free mind. And is not that useful by which he

has been set free? Such a man finds that he can stand by something absolute when he judges the conventionality of his time, in which the majority believes, as the majority in each age has believed in its fashions. Those who by their wisdom or by their scorn have made their generations better, he knows what they have said and done, and he finds them the champions of what he himself feels to be best. To know how they believed or how they fought in the past is for the present the knowledge worth having. Wise men are greater than their times; to be trained by them is to be a little greater than the inward pettiness of our own time, or its blatancy, or its ephemeral meanness. It is to be a little greater, because we know a little our weaknesses. There is this discontent which is fruitful, a happy result of knowledge. And this discontent with the many leads us to better understand the few now —those who in our generation are thinking and acting as, most truly, minds in the present, but not of it. What are the opinions of most of us but "the collection of notions we happen to have." Like books pleasing to fallible licensers, we speak "but the language of times." Wait but some years, and as we have opposed the true and the beautiful we shall be in the most real sense forgotten, unless remembered as opponents of the soon-acknowledged best interests of men. Even the very words spoken against those whom all men now reverence—the very words which gave great men partly a cause to speak—these can be found out only by the working of a curious seeker into the past, and have now a value merely accidental. Is there not the most striking instance of one not known to be altogether base, whom men know now as the representative of established law and custom, under whom suffered that Just Man called a rebel and a blasphemer?

Education is for All Life.—It cannot be said that this is to make too high a claim for education. It is absurd to talk of free minds being for doctors and for lawyers, but not for those who perhaps are in even more really important ways of life, merchants and farmers. Every state of life makes its pedants. To save us there are teachers—those greatest among men who can free us all from our special pedantry. The advice of that admirable physician, the author of *Rab and His Friends*, to medical students in

Edinburgh, is an advice worth repeating, if even one in any state be led to follow it. The advice was to study or read every day something of the world's best literature, learning to have faith in it and to honestly delight in it. Will not the doctor, or whatever he be, find that it is useful, as he is a man, to have as a power within him the knowledge of what are the wisest and the most beautiful things that have been said by men? Are our colleges always teaching our young men to have the right feeling towards books, the right sense that education is unending?

And how far can a university lead us? No doubt, as a clear thinker has said, "the true and adequate end of intellectual training and of a university is not learning or acquirement, but rather is thought or reason exercised upon knowledge, or what may be called philosophy." Yet Carlyle's experience of the most that a university can directly do, must of necessity be our experience; and anyway, nothing can make up for the lack in a man, afterwards, of a growing strength of thought increasing with his life. Carlyle says: "If we think of it, all that a university, a final highest school, can do for us, is still but what the first school began doing—teach us to *read*. It depends on what we read, after all manner of professors have done their best for us. The true university of these days is a collection of books . . . a great library of good books, which, after you have done with all your classes, you proceed to study and read. What the university can mainly do for you,—what I have found the university did for me,—is," he confesses, "that it taught me to read in various languages, in various sciences, so that I could go into the books which treated of these things, gradually penetrate into any department I wanted to make myself master of, as I found it suit me." What use do we urge our students to make of libraries? What wise freedom of choice do we offer those becoming fitted to choose? How many have we of Emerson's "Professors of Books?"

Thus penetrating that studying, though coming out for other work and play, which, perhaps, must be kept in hand, men become educated, gain a liberal education, the result of single-minded devotion in mental things; always learning, not only numbers of things distinct, but learning "to leaven the dense mass of facts and events with the elastic force of reason."

"The intellect which has been disciplined to the perfection of its powers, which knows, and thinks while it knows; such an intellect cannot be partial, cannot be exclusive, cannot be impetuous, cannot be at a loss, cannot but be patient, collected, and calm, because it discerns the end in every beginning, the origin in every end, the law in every interruption, the limit in each delay; because it ever knows where it stands, and how its path lies from one point to another.

> "Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
> Atque metus omnes, et inexorabile fatum
> Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari."

To quote further from Cardinal Newman on the Utility of University Education:

"The man trained to reason—the philosopher—has the same command of matters of thought which the true citizen and gentleman has of matters of business and conduct.

"If then a practical end must be assigned to a university course I say it is that of training good members of society. Its art is the art of social life, and its end is fitness for the world. It neither confines its views to particular professions on the one hand, nor creates heroes or inspires genius on the other. Works indeed of genius fall under no art; heroic minds come under no rule; a university is not a birthplace of poets or of immortal authors, of founders of schools, leaders of colonies, or conquerors of nations. It does not promise a generation of Aristotles, or Newtons, of Napoleons or Washingtons, of Raphaels or Shakespeares, though such miracles of nature it has before now contained within its precincts. Nor is it content, on the other hand, with forming the critic or the experimentalist, the economist or the engineer, though such, too, it includes within its scope.

"But a University training is the great but ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspiration, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political powers, and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear, conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, and eloquence in expressing them and a force in urging them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to go right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what is sophistical and to discard what is irrelevant. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility. It shows him how to accommodate himself to others, how to come to an understanding with them, how to bear with them. He is at home in any society, he has common ground with every class; he knows when to speak and when to be silent; he is able to converse; he is able to listen; he can ask a question pertinently, and gain a lesson seasonably, when he has nothing to impart himself; he is ever ready, yet never in the way; he

is a pleasant companion and a comrade you can depend upon; he knows when to be serious and when to trifle, and he has a sure tact which enables him to trifle with gracefulness and to be serious with effect. He has the repose of a mind which lives in itself while it lives in the world, and which has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad. He has a gift which serves him in public and supports him in retirement, without which good fortune is but vulgar, and with which failure and disappointment have a charm. The art which tends to make a man all this is in the object which it pursues as useful as the art of wealth or the art of health, though it is less susceptible of method, and less tangible, less complete in its result."

W. F. P. STOCKLEY.

Fredericton, Canada.

LUKE DELMEGE:—PART II. ILLUMINATION.[1]

XXXII.—PERCUSSA ET HUMILIATA.

WHEN Sister Mary laid aside her Norman cap, at night, she also laid down her crown of thorns; and, with her blue mantella, she put aside the cross she was bearing, so bravely and lovingly. For it was a mighty cross, assumed in a spirit of love and penance; and it bore down to the earth sometimes the frail figure that supported it. For Nature is ever in protest against the spirit; and is ever asking querulously, Why? why? when the soul seeks pain, and the body cries for rest. But sleep brought more than rest to this penitent spirit. It brought dreams; and dreams brought anguish to the daylight. But they were very beautiful. Were there no waking, they would have made Heaven. And now some of these dreams occurred again and again; and Sister Mary was obliged, so very beautiful they were in sleep, so dread in the consciousness of day, to ask prayers frequently against their recurrence.

"Pray, Sister," she would say to the nun in charge of the dormitory, "that I may not dream to-night!"

But the dream that used to dawn out of the shadows of sleep most frequently was this. She thought she walked in a great garden, beneath the umbrage of trees, and brushed by the great, beautiful flowers, that leaned towards her to touch her feet, her hands

[1] *Copyrighted*, 1901, by the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

and her garments. And in the garden was a mighty palace, always lighted for a festival; and she saw a long procession of the white-robed immortals entering slowly, but with uplifted faces, on which the lights of the banqueting hall shone. And, when all had entered, and the doors were about to be shut, a Figure came to the portals, and, shading His eyes with His right hand, looked long and lingeringly into the darkness. And Mary knew that it was herself was the desired one; but she dared not come out of the darkness into the light, because the robes of humiliation were around her; and the blue serge of sorrow was not a fitting garment for the splendors of the King's Hall. So she turned away from the questing eyes; and sought the shadows again. Then she was suddenly aware that a Voice, quite near, called her; and that she was sought out amongst the shadows. For she heard, ever and again, the whisper: *Veni, Sponsa! Veni, Immaculata! Veni, Sponsa mea!* and then a hand was laid gently upon her. She was found, and reproached. But she could only point to the blue garment of penitence, and weep. And then she found herself in the Hall of the King; and with His own wounded hands He put on the bridal robes—the soft, white habit, and the veil, and drew around her the blue cincture and let the scapulary fall; and He hung the Silver Heart on her breast, and tied the rosary to her girdle; and lo! she was a Sister of the Good Shepherd. And He led her trembling into the lighted Hall; and all her Sisters gathered around her, and kissed her—and then,—well, then, she would wake up on her narrow bed in the gloom of a winter's morning, with just a yellow gas-jet above her head; and, ah, yes! here was the blue serge mantella and skirt; and here the high, frilled, Norman cap—the badge of penitence and shame. No wonder that her heart sank like lead, and that a film crossed her eyes, as she went about her weary work for yet another day; until, perhaps at Mass, or afterwards in the hushed silence of the afternoon, she would study and watch the white figure of her crucifix; and, then, with one swift aërial flight, as a mother-bird swoops on her nest she would fly on the wings of love, and fold herself and nestle in the big, gaping wounds of the torn side of Christ; and then all was peace again until another dream.

But there were other sorrows, too, awaiting her, deep humilia-

tions, that plunged her into the abyss, until rescued by prayer and faith. There is no use in arguing against the inexorable law. The gold *must* be fire-tried.

There was one young penitent who was the special object of Sister Mary's solicitude. She had come into this sacred asylum again and again; and again and again she had gone out unto the dread attractions of the midnight streets. But always, when she knocked humbly at the Convent gate, she was admitted with a smile of welcome. The charity of this Order, like the charity of Christ, is inexhaustible. It would be a terrifying novelty, except to those accustomed to the supernatural, to witness the fierce fury of the temptations that used to assail this young girl—the paroxysms under which she strove to resist her own dread inclinations, and the wiles of the unseen. It was here that Sister Mary had been most successful. Because, although her efforts at reclamation of this sister-penitent were doomed to disappointment, and the bird was for ever breaking from her hands, there was some tie between them, some bond of love, that might have been stretched and strained, but was never broken. And whenever she returned, clothed in her right senses, after the spell of midnight madness, it was always Sister Mary who was privileged to take off the soiled gewgaws of fashion, and put on the cleaner vestures of penitence and grace. There was therefore great love between them, the love of the rescued and the rescuer.

Well, one day, after the dream of the Espousals, the old fury seized on this young girl; and she announced her intention of leaving the asylum. And, as there was perfect freedom to come or to go, the permission was accorded. She had most carefully screened her intention from Sister Mary, lest the entreaties of the latter should compel her to forego her resolution; and it so happened, that Laura Desmond (this was the young girl's name) was passing down the long corridor, in which was the oratory and the niched statue of the Good Shepherd, when she heard rapid footsteps echoing on the tiled pavement behind her. She did not look around. She fled. There was a moment's delay in opening the gate that led into the outer world; and she felt a gentle hand laid on her shoulder, and a voice as from eternity said: "Laura!"

"Well?" said Laura, turning fiercely on her pursuer.

"You are not leaving us?" said Sister Mary.

"I beg yer pardin: I am though," said the poor girl.

"Turning your back on the Sisters, and on Father Tracey, and on—our Lord?" said the pleading voice.

"That's me own business," said the poor fugitive.

"And then, going out to the world—and the horrors—the awful horrors of the streets?" And Sister Mary's hand trembled on the shoulder of the poor girl.

"Ye seem to know a good deal about them," sneered the poor girl. "Come, Mary, yerself, and we'll have a good time. Sure, ye can come back agin!"

"What awful spirit possesses you?" said Sister Mary, starting back, horror-stricken. "Oh, child, child! come back! come back to God! There's no harm done yet. Return! and all will be well!"

But the dark spirit was filling to repletion this doomed soul. And he spoke: "Is it you'll make me?" he said.

"Not I, but our Lord," said Sister Mary.

"Stand back, and lem'me pass!" he shouted.

The gentle hand was still on the girl's shoulder. It now stole around her neck.

"Wance more, I say, stand back, and lem'me pass!"

The arm unconsciously tightened around her neck.

"There, thin, take that!" and Sister Mary felt a stinging blow on the face, and she reeled and fell. And, as she fell, the wretched girl tore off her own scapulars and beads, and flung them on the prostrate form. Then she tore her frantic way into the outer world.

But, a greater Power pursued her. She had reached the outer gate that led into the road, when she thought the world was falling to pieces, and that the end of all things had come. The trees seemed to crash down on her path, and the great iron gate smote her as with steel gauntlets. Earth rose up to overwhelm her, and the universe seemed rushing to ruin around her. There was a sound in her ears of mighty waters that had broken their bounds, and were heaving and plunging in illimitable ruin, and a great darkness came down out of the angry skies, and whelmed all things in a dread and fateful night. And then, as an end to the sudden and fearful cataclysm, all was still, and all was dead.

When, after three days of unconsciousness, but of dread convulsions, Laura Desmond woke up from her epileptic fit in the Convent infirmary, it was quite clear that she had been saved. The brand was snatched from the burning, and would never again feed the flames. Her beauty was gone. One side of her face was hopelessly paralyzed.

During these three days Sister Mary knocked furiously at the gates of Divine Mercy; but varied her supplications with loud and fervent hosannas for the redemption of that soul. And when she heard that the poor patient had recovered consciousness, but was a hopeless, physical wreck, great were her jubilation and thanksgiving. "What!" exclaims our ardent humanitarian; "jubilation over a wrecked and shattered body? Where is humanity and fellow feeling? And the Divine Altruism, etc., etc.?" Even so, my good friend! Such are the ways of these strange people, called Catholics, and the still more strange elect amongst them, called Saints. For to them a shattered and broken frame, even though it was honeycombed with a thousand diseases and racked by a million nerves, is a better thing than an impure body, were it that of Aphrodite herself; and, beyond the body, though still its inhabitant, and immeasurably separated from it in importance, is the soul; and the soul, the soul, the soul, here is the one thing that takes the place of gold and consols, scrips and shares, in the divine economy of the Church. And hence, Sister Mary rejoiced and was exceeding glad, because her little client could never again go forth to snare the unwary with her eyes and mouth. And, as for the rest, here was peace and rest, and all that Divine Charity could effect for the solace of the stricken one, and her strengthening under her trial.

A few days after the patient had recovered consciousness, Sister Mary was admitted to see her. She was not prepared for her reception. For the moment, the eyes of the poor girl, wandering around the infirmary, rested on the meek face of her rescuer, a look of awe and unspeakable dread crossed her face. She looked pleadingly at the Sister Infirmarian, who interpreted the look as one of aversion and pain, and who instantly said:

"Sister Mary, your presence is painful to this poor child. I think you had better leave the infirmary. And, if you have hurt this poor girl's feelings, ask God to forgive you."

The patient seemed to make a feeble protest, which the Infirmarian interpreted as assent; and Sister Mary bowed her head, and left the room.

The following Saturday, the penitents around Father Tracey's confessional were quite sure they heard the sound of sobbing, when Sister Mary was at confession. And, on this occasion, she remained a very long and most unusual time on her knees. And they wondered, when they saw her emerge, with red, swollen eyes—it was so unlike her, who was always so calm and composed. But their wonder was nothing to that of Father Tracey, who, commencing with his usual formula, "Yes, yes, my dear, to be sure!" was surprised to hear behind the screen the sound of a voice broken with sobs, and utterly unable to proceed with the usual weekly confession. Then a transformation took place. His great saint, whom he had feared to address, was but human after all. She, too, had come down from the mountains into the valley of desolation, and claimed comfort and strength at his priestly hands. And as nothing melts the heart of a priest so much as an appeal for help and pity, this holy servant threw aside all his reserve and fear; and drawing out gently the source of sorrow from this afflicted soul, he poured out of his great priestly heart a torrent of balm and consolation, until his very emotion choked him, and he wondered at himself, as he closed this first exhortation to that soul with the words: "*Thou didst call upon me in affliction, and I delivered thee; I heard thee in the secret place of tempest; I proved thee at the waters of contradiction.*"

Some days elapsed; and Sister Mary was alone in the infirmary with Laura Desmond. The latter had recovered the use of speech; but her faculties seemed to be wandering. At least, she stared at Sister Mary, as at an apparition; and, after a long time, and many kind things said by the latter, Laura drew her down gently, until her face almost touched the poor paralyzed cheek, and whispered:

"Who are you?"

"Don't you know me, dear,—Sister Mary, your old friend?"

"You are *not* Sister Mary," said Laura; "nor Sister anything else! Who *are* you?"

"There now, dear," said her friend, thinking this was the delirium of illness. "Rest, and only talk in a whisper to God!"

"I will," said the poor patient. "But I'd like to know who you are."

"Dear God! restore her to her senses!" said Sister Mary. "I am one of the Magdalens, dear, a poor soul, like yourself, whom the love of the Sacred Heart has rescued."

Laura shook her head. "Don't tell me," she whispered. "You are nothing of the kind. *You* never sinned. Don't tell me!"

"We have all sinned, dear," said Sister Mary. "We are all unworthy children. It is but God's mercy that spares us."

"You are good," said Laura, "and you should not lie. You are *not* a Magdalen."

Then Sister Mary felt the hot blood mounting to face and forehead, as she drew back from the revelation.

"There," said Laura, pulling down the sweet face again, and touching the cheek with her finger, "there's where I struck you, may God, in His mercy, forgive me! There is the print of my four fingers."

"Forget it, dear," said Sister Mary; "although it was a happy thing for me and you."

"An' you won't tell me who you are," said Laura. "Well, some day I'll find out—"

"No! no!" said Mary, frightened. "Leave me as I am. It's God's will."

"I suppose now," said the affectionate girl, "some mother is thinkin' of you, and wondherin' where you are; or your father is wishin' that he had you with him, and that he could sthroke down your beautiful hair, like this—"

"Don't, dear, don't," said Sister Mary. "We are all gathered here by God. Let us forget everything else."

"Well, whatever you like," said Laura. "But you're not wan of us. Don't tell me. You're not wan of us, whoever you are."

Sister Mary left it so, answering nothing. But the poor puzzled brain was busy solving the enigma. It was clear, clear as noonday to this poor girl's infallible instincts that her friend, though she wore the garb of penitence, was immaculate before God. How she arrived at the conclusion, it would be difficult to conjecture. It might have been some faculty, like that which the saints possessed, but struggling and obscure, and which recognized that

here were none of the indelible marks of sin, which remain, even after years of repentance. But it was quite clear that she saw something quite unique, and different from ordinary experience in this girl, who had so often rescued her; and her poor brain began to trace causes and origins and reasons for the bewildering fact, that a sinless soul had chosen to assume a character from which everyone, not imbued with the charity of Christ, turns away with loathing and abhorrence. It was inexplicable, a deep, awful mystery for which there was no explanation. For days Laura Desmond dwelt and rested on the thought. Sometimes she would watch Sister Mary doing the ordinary offices of the infirmary, where she was assistant—watch her with curious speculation in her eyes. And when her good friend came over to perform some little kindly act around her bedside, or to ask a question, or to whisper a prayer, Laura would stare her all over with the unconsciousness of a child, and study her eyes and mouth, and touch her hair and her dress, and take up her hand to study it, like a palmist; and then would turn away to pursue the vast enigma which was thrown on the blurred canvas of her own life.

After many days of deep cogitation; and after patching and piecing together all that she had ever heard of, and all her own experiences of Sister Mary, she came to a dread conclusion, which plunged her back into despair. It was midnight when it seized her in her sleepless meditations; and, starting up wildly, she rang her bell, and summoned the Sister Infirmarian. In a moment the latter was by her bedside, but was appalled to see the look of horror and dismay on the features of her poor patient.

"Call the priest," was the cry, "at once! at once!"

And so Father Tracey heard in his slumbers the familiar sound of the midnight bell, and woke up, confused, and put on in a dream his dingy clothes, praying and asking: "What poor soul wants me now?"

Let us repeat here, what we have already said somewhere, that if there be on earth one reward greater than another for the sacrifice a priest is for ever called upon to make for his flock, it is the dawn of hope and comfort that shines in the eyes and on the faces of the pain-stricken, or the sorrowful, or the despairing, when a priest approaches their bed of sickness or suffering, and

all the phantoms that haunt poor humanity fly at his approach. The murmured "Thank you!" the little laugh, half-smothered, of triumph and peace; the very manner in which the sick and the wounded arrange themselves on their couches of sorrow, as if they said: "I have got a new lease of life now; for the Healer and Consoler is here!"—all this faith and confidence and hope, placed in his very presence, as apart from his ministrations, is a reward, so far beyond all earthly guerdons and triumphs that it can only be said to foreshadow the blisses of eternity. So, at least, Father Tracey felt; and so did he thank God every moment for the sublime vocation, which, in all humility and meekness, he was discharging.

When he entered the infirmary this night, every one gathered around Laura Desmond's sick-bed felt a kind of sensible relief. And she turned to him wistfully, and when he bent down to hear what she had to say, she locked one finger in the button-hole of his coat, as if to secure him beyond all doubt. Then, in a husky voice, she whispered her secret.

He drew back in amazement, and looked at her, as if her mind was astray. When she persisted, he only smiled, which seemed to reassure her; and then he laughed the idea to scorn. This seemed to compose the poor girl, but she held the button-hole firmly.

"On your word of honor, as a priest, are ye tellin' me the truth?"

"Of course I am," he cried. "Compose yourself, child, and try and get some sleep."

"There's no more sleep for me," she said, "until I get God's assurance that it is not so."

"Take my assurance," he said. "What more can you have?"

"Very well, yer reverence. But I tell you this,—she's no more wan of us, than—than—than—"

"That may be, too," he said, although he felt he was venturing dangerously near the King's Secret. "God alone knows the secrets of hearts."

"Thin why is she here?" asked the bewildered girl. "Sure this is no place for her likes. Unless," she drifted back to the old idea, "she is what I say."

"Put that idea forever from your mind," he said, gently disengaging himself. "And pray, pray. There are more saints in the world than the world is aware of."

A few days afterwards he had a long conference with Sister Eulalie on the subject.

"Sometimes I begin to doubt, myself," he said. "The whole thing is so strange and wonderful and beautiful. It will be many a day before the idea leaves that poor girl's mind."

"It is strange and beautiful," said Sister Eulalie. "Sometimes, I am inclined to kneel down and kiss the ground where she walks. And fancy poor Luke's suspicions about imposture and hysteria."

"You're quite sure you know her?" Father Tracey said meditatively. "That you have seen her; and there is no doubt?"

"There! you're nearly as bad as Laura," said Sister Eulalie. "There is no mistake, except that, God forgive me, I thought ill, too, of this sweet saint, and thought her stuck-up and proud, and disdainful."

"But you may be mistaken, my dear," said Father Tracey. "One never knows. And fancy, if—"

"There now, you're off, too. There's no doubt, Father," she said, reassuringly. "It is she; and she does not dream that we know of her and her awful vow."

And Sister Eulalie shuddered to think if such an oblation were ever required of her.

Sister Mary began to be very much pained and very much bewildered. Just as her confessor began to regard her as human, and therefore pitiable, her associates began to consider her as something superhuman and celestial, and sent amongst them through some secret and ineffable design of God. It was a long time before Sister Mary's humility would permit her to recognize this fact. Nay, even, she regarded the reverence and timid shrinking from her, the slipping aside from her path when she appeared amongst a group of penitents, the sudden silence, the quiet watchfulness that followed all her movements, as indications of aversion and suspicion. And, interpreting all this by the remark of the Sister Infirmarian after Laura's recovery of consciousness, she concluded that, in some way, she had been guilty of undue harshness, apparently as the result of self-conceit, and that she was, in con-

sequence thereof, shunned and disliked by those she loved so much. It was a subtle and most painful delusion, and it caused her infinite anxiety. It was the sharpest mortification she had yet received. The cross was weighing heavily; the thorns were pressing sharply, and she was about to faint. Then one day, to her intense amazement, she found, as she passed by a group with averted faces, her mantella slightly touched, and, turning around, she found that one of the group had raised it reverently and kissed it. And she trembled all over with the sudden revelation that she was regarded with reverence, and not aversion, and then she grew pale and trembled still more, for the dread that the mighty secret of her life was about to be revealed.

The truth was, that Laura's whispered suspicions, though stilled by the voice of authority, had taken wing and flown from soul to soul of the community of penitents, and very wild surmises were afloat. "There are more saints in the world than the world is aware of," said their own dear saint, Father Tracey. Well then, who knows? Doesn't every man, woman, and child in Ireland understand and believe that in one shape or another the Blessed Virgin, the great Mary of Ireland, the Mary of her ancient litanies and Masses, is always amongst the Irish people? Hasn't her sweet face been seen again and again? Hasn't she appeared to poor sinners on their deathbeds, and haven't they pointed out her white, refulgent figure to the priest, as she hovered over their beds and beckoned them to Paradise? Hasn't she appeared to little girls over there in France? Why not, therefore, to her own Irish, who love her more than all the world beside? Well, we say nothing, but we think a good deal, even we, poor penitents. May not the all-sinless one have come down here, and put on our poor garments, even as her Son put on the flesh that had sinned? Oh, no, we daren't say anything; but—who knows?

And Laura's dread thought, that this might be the very Mother of God whom she struck with her open hand—the dread thought that rang the midnight bell, and summoned Father Tracey from his dreamless sleep, began to pursue its way, under a thousand modifications, through the minds and hearts of these poor, repentant ones; and although no one dared breathe such a whisper, and Sister Mary could only conjecture that there had come a great

change over her associates, she only knew that her cross had been suddenly lifted by an Unseen Hand, and that He had verified His words: "I heard thee in the secret place of tempest; I proved thee at the waters of contradiction."

XXXIII.—Dagon Dismembered.

The last words of Father Cussen in the library at Seaview Cottage may be said to have commenced Luke Delmege's Illumination. The world's catchwords seemed to have lost all meaning in the appeal to God. He began to understand how divine was the vocation of the Church in its mission to the individual, and how sublime was her carelessness under what form of government she worked, so long as she was not interfered with in her quest after human souls. Side by side with this conviction there grew up the perception that his own race were following out this divine apostolate in secret and hidden ways. Sometimes, when entering a city convent, he would meet a batch of nuns just returned from Benin, or a young Irish Sister just about to start for Java. And they thought no more of the journey and its hardships than if it were a picnic to some picturesque spot on the Shannon. And he found the entire burden of their conversation was the souls of black, nude niggers, whom modern imperialism would gladly blow into space with lyddite and dynamite, or corrupt and corrode into disease and death by the agencies of modern civilization. And when these young martyr apostles left, they left behind them the divine contagion; and little Irish children, who, perhaps, themselves were in want of bread, brought their halfpennies to the treasury of the convent, "to buy a black baby for God." And Luke's heart often wailed aloud, because he had turned his back once and forever on the same divine vocation; and his conscience murmured more than once, Idiota! Idiota! But he had gained two facts by experience: (1) That the individual soul was everything to the Church and God; and (2) that the feigned and fictitious watchwords of the new gospel of humanity were the unspoken but well-fulfilled vows of his own race. "The horseleech hath two daughters which say, Give! give!" But "renunciation" is the motto of the apostles of his race.

So, too, there began to dawn upon him, stealthily and in-

sensibly, the marvellous beauties even of the most commonplace landscapes of Ireland. The very solitude, which had oppressed him with such lonely and melancholy feelings, began to assume a strange and singular charm. There was a mysterious light over everything that gave an aspect of dreamland and enchantment, or of old, far-off times, even to the long, lonely fields, or the dark, sullen bogland. He could not well define it. There was some association haunting everything, inexpressibly sweet, but so vague, so elusive, he could not define what it was. The fields in the twilight had a curious color or cloudland hanging over them, that reminded him of something sweet and beautiful and far away; but this memory or imagination could never seize and hold. And when, on one of these gray days, which are so lovely in Ireland, as the light falls sombre and neutral on all things, a plover would shriek across the moorland, or a curlew would rise up and beat his lonely way, complaining and afraid, across the ashen sky, Luke would feel that he had seen it all before in some waking dream of childhood; but all associations had vanished. The magic of Nature alone remained. But the mountains, the mountains haunted him perpetually. He never rose in the morning without asking, How will my mountains look to-day? And whether the great Artist had drawn them far away in a beautiful mist of pencilled shadow, and they leaned, like a cloud, on the horizon; or brought them up close and defiant, their blue-black faces seamed and jagged, where the yellow torrents had torn off the soft peat covering and left the yellow loam and red pebbles distinctly visible, the same dim, haunting memories hung around them, and he asked himself a hundred times, Where have I seen all this before? And how does Nature, as she pushes forward her mountains or withdraws them, and paints them every day with a different brush—how does she draw on the background of memory some shadowy, elusive picture, and associate it so strongly with that marvellous coloring on mountain, and cloud, and sky?

The October of this year, too, was a marvel of beauty. The weather was so dry and frostless that Nature took a long time to disrobe herself, and she changed her garments in such beautiful, varied ways that the landscape became a shifting mass of color. There was no sun, either, to make the gradual decay too palpable

—only a hushed, gray color over all the land. And Luke watched the beautiful death from the moment the chestnut put out her pale, yellow leaf, and became a golden blot on the thick mass of foliage, which filled the entire hill behind the village, until all was over, and only the evergreens vaunted their immortality. Every day was a new pleasure; and he began to think, with some contempt, of long, dusty streets, and the stupid uniformity of houses, and the asphalt pavements, and the miserable patch of blue sky, which one is privileged to see in cities. And to think, also, that there is such a thing as the populous deserts of civilization, where man is but an exile and a waif; and the delightful, homelike feeling in Ireland, where you feel you are always sitting by your mother's hearth; and, come weal, come woe, this is home, and all around are friends and lovers.

And, as in a happy home, the very worries and vexations of life have their own charm, so Luke began to find, in everyday simple and very prosaic experiences, a relief from thought that was quite refreshing.

It is true, indeed, that the eternal squabbles of the kitchen hurt his nerves, until he began to find that they meant but little; and that the strong language sometimes used was only the hyperbole of a people who are used to express themselves picturesquely. When Mary described John as "the most outrageous fool that the Lord ever created. He don't know his right hand from his lef';" and when John averred that "Mary had the worst tongue the Lord ever put the bret' of life in;" and that her "looks would peel potatoes, and turn sugar into vinegar, and even sour the crame in the middle of winter," it disturbed Luke very much, until he heard a musical duet of laughter from the kitchen five minutes after, and an experienced friend assured him that it was a sound maxim of domestic economy that when a man and the maid fell out, the master's interests were safe. So, too, when approaching the stable in the morning he heard unmistakable sounds of dancing to the everlasting tune of "Welt the flure, Biddy McClure," and knew, by every law of sense and reason, that John was practising a heel-and-toe for the dance at the cross-roads the following Sunday; and when he found the said John, sitting demurely on a soap-box, and polishing the harness for all it was worth, he began to think he had a Valentine Vousden in disguise.

"I thought I heard the sounds of dancing," Luke would say, in a puzzled manner.

"Dancin'? yer reverence. Ye hard the little mare stampin' her feet."

"Stamping her feet? What for?"

"'Tis a way she has whin she's hungry," John would reply. "She's not aisy in her mind since ye cut her aff her oats." And Luke would give up the riddle.

He found, too, that in the horticultural department, John's knowledge was strictly limited to the cultivation of potatoes, and his experience of flowers was equally circumscribed. In young ladies' "books of confessions," a favorite flower always has a place, the tastes varying from a daisy up to an amaranth. John had his favorite flower. It was the homely nasturtium; and he was so loyal to this love that he declined to have charge of the more aristocratic garden-belles which Luke affected.

"It costs no throuble," said John.

"It is only a weed," said Luke.

"'Tis just as purty as thim that must be watched and tinded like a baby," said John.

"The very etymology of the flower condemns it," said Luke.

"Well, indeed, it hasn't much of a scint," said John.

"I didn't mean that. I meant it has a nasty name—"

"There's many a wan has a bad name as doesn't deserve it," said John.

It is not difficult to sympathize with John's tastes. It is impossible not to feel a kind of pitying love for Nature's homely creations. They are so generous, so prodigal of their beauties, that one cannot help being grateful; and, like gypsy-children, they thrive in all weathers without care; and Mother Nature loves them because they do credit to her handiwork without any help from the bungling and blundering hands of man. There is reason to fear that contempt is largely blended with our admiration of the Lady Rose. She is a petted and spoiled beauty. She must have attention and admiration. She must have her toilette carefully made every morning; and *eheu, infandum!* she must have those ugly green parasites brushed away from her lovely petals; and, more dreadful still, the dainty lady has to be fumigated and disin-

fected; and, with all, as she hangs her lovely and languishing head with rain or dew-pearls in her bosom, no bird or bee will come nigh her. And here, in the same bed, up springs a hardy tramp of a thistle, and careless of wind or rain, and untouched by parasites, he shoves his yellow, unkempt head above the golden tresses of my rose; and the sparrows steal away his frowsy petals, and the bees find something sweet deep down in his scraggy breast. Or that insolent, lawless beggar, Robin-run-the-hedge, draws his ill-smelling coils around the dainty lady, and smothers her in his embraces, and mounts up, higher and higher, until he flaunts his white, clear bell flowers, a summer anemone, high above the regal rose-crests. Of course, the policeman, that is the gardener, comes and carries off these tramps to jail or death,—that's the way with the world—the hardy child of the people must give place to the perfumed and delicate aristocrat. Nevertheless, there are a few that sympathize with Mother Nature's children, and amongst them may be numbered John and—another.

It may be presumed, therefore, that Luke, with his passion for flowers, got little help, and a considerable amount of embarrassment from his gardener. His large ambition to reduce the picturesque irregularities of Irish life to the dull, rectangular monotony of geometrical perfection, was here too, in large measure, doomed to disappointment. It was quite useless to try to persuade John that all this digging and manuring and clipping and watering and cutting was recompensed by the fleeting beauties of what he called "a few posies," which hung out their fragile loveliness and scented the air for a few days, and then peevishly threw down their pretty petals the moment a light breeze disturbed them or a shower of rain bowed them to the earth. Neither could he see the use of cutting flower-beds into diagrams of Euclid; and his heart smote him as he ran the razored edges of the lawn-mower across the grass, and all the pretty daisies lay decapitated beneath the ruthless guillotine.

"Begor," he said, "the masther was watchin' all the winther to see the first daisy put up her purty little head; and you'd think he'd go mad whin the first primrose looked out of the black earth. And here he's now with his: 'John, cut down thim daisies;' 'John, that grass is dirty;' 'John, get away thim weeds.'

Did ye iver hear the likes of it?" And John was discontented, and the "masther" was in despair.

"Bring out the bulbs that you took up last winter," said Luke, late in the October of this year.

"What balls?" said John.

"The tulip and hyacinth bulbs which I gave you to put by against the winter," said Luke.

John was bewildered. Mary heard the conversation and giggled.

"Yer reverence giv me no hicense," said John, fairly puzzled.

"I gave you last May four dozen of tulips from this bed, and two dozen hyacinths from these beds," said Luke, angrily pointing to where the geraniums and begonias had just been lifted.

John was still puzzled. Then a great light dawned, and he looked at his master with all the compassion of superior knowledge.

"Oh! thim inguns, your reverence! Yerra, sure the chickens ate every wan of thim."

"What?" cried Luke, now thoroughly angry. "Do you mean to say that you have thrown away those tulips that cost me four shillings, and those hyacinths that cost six a dozen?"

"Yerra, not at all," said John, smiling. "Sure ye can get any amount of thim up at Miss Smiddy's. They're hanging in ropes from the ceiling, and they're chape now. I'll get a dozen for ye for tuppence."

Then Luke collapsed. He was genuinely angry; what florist would not be? And he half made up his mind that John should go. He was incorrigible and utterly incapable of being educated. After long and deep deliberation, in which the saying of a friend, whom he had often consulted on John's retention and dismissal, "If you hunt him, you'll only be gettin' a bigger blagard!" came frequently uppermost, he at last decided that he could not stand this worry. He told Mary that John should go. Mary had been laughing at John all the morning, and had told him several times that it was all up now. The master would never forgive "thim chewlips." He should go. Luke was surprised to find Mary bursting into an agony of tears, and rushing wildly from the room. But he was inexorable. The misery was going on too long and should be ended. He moved out towards the stables with a cer-

tain amount of nervousness, for he hated to do an unkind thing. Instead of the usual patter of dancing, he heard the sound as of prayer. He listened. John was preparing for confession, and making his examination of conscience aloud. Luke walked away, but he was determined. When he thought the examen was over, he returned. John was making his act of contrition. There was no harm in listening there. The voice came, broken with sobs—yea, the voice of John! It said, amidst the weeping:

What was Thine of sorrow and pain, O Thou, who in heaven dost reign,
O King, both good and great;
It comes not into my mind, the amount to find,
Nor, if found, could my tongue relate
The bitter anguish and smart of Thy Sacred Heart,
And the spear-cleft in Thy side,
That moved with a holy awe of Thy Sacred Law
Even kings on their thrones of pride.

O Father! O Jesus mine! who by Thy Death Divine
With life our souls dost warm,
Thou, in creation's hour, whose plastic power
Made man to Thy own blessed form,
Is it not, O Christ! O King! a cruel, cruel thing
That nought has been loved by me
Save sins that the soul defile, save all things base and vile,
That are loathsome unto Thee?

It was the beautiful old lay of the Sacred Heart, translated from the ancient Irish,[1] and which John had picked up at the church door and retained,—as it appealed strongly to his fancy,—as an act of contrition. Everything in prayer and proverb that rhymes or sings touches the heart of Ireland. And Luke heard the sound of sobbing again as John went over the line:

Is it not, O Christ! O King! a ca-ru-el, ca-ru-el thing?

Then he turned away, muttering, Poor fellow! and John was saved.

A few days after, Luke was summoned to his mother's funeral. She had lingered on through the summer; and though Death had taken up permanent lodgings in the house, he was afraid to ask his hostess to leave with him. But one night he stole through the door and a soul was with him. The good old mother had

[1] By D. F. McCarthy.

passed away in her sleep whilst the household slumbered. She was spared the pain of weepers and watchers around her as she stole over the threshold and out into the night.

With all his intense dislike for noise, or demonstration, or too much ceremonial for the dead or for the living, Luke was hoping that his mother's obsequies would be celebrated as quietly as possible. The last wish of the deceased, "to have a dacent funeral," did not quite agree with his instinctive hatred of fuss and noise. But the matter was quietly taken out of his hands. To his intense amazement, nearly thirty priests had assembled on the morning of the funeral. They had come from all parts of the diocese. Some of them Luke had never seen before. The names of others were unfamiliar to him. No matter! This was a priest's mother. She shared in the Levitical consecration of her son. She should be equally honored. There was to be a full Office and Mass for the Dead.

The morning was wet. Someone said, "It rained ramrods." The little sacristy was full of priests, whose friezes and mackintoshes created little lakes of water everywhere. Some had come ten miles, some twelve, some even nineteen, straight away from the stations, that last through October and into the first week of November. Luke, touched to the heart, had great pity for them.

"We'll have but one Nocturn," he whispered to the master of ceremonies. The latter went over to the Canon, who was to preside. He brought back word that the entire Office should be sung. It was the wish of all the priests. And Father Daly, too, was one of the chanters; and very beautifully he intoned the noble antiphons of the sublime Office of the Dead. The church was packed to its farthest extremity by a silent, devout congregation. From their wet, sodden clothes steamed up a cloud of vapor that mingled with the incense smoke and filled the entire church with a heavy haze. They too had come from far distances to testify their reverence for the dead. And Luke remembered there, in the dawn of his great illumination, that all this was slightly different from the cold, mechanical heartlessness of England, where the dead were unprayed for and unremembered; and a few black mourning coaches were the only testimony of respect to the lump of clay which had to be hustled from the sight of the living as speedily as possible.

The long procession commenced. Larry, the old retainer, jealous for the honor of his family, counted carefully every car.

"There wor wan hundred and thirty," he told old Mike Delmege afterwards, "and twinty horsemen. There should be wan hundred and thirty-six, if she had her rights, and if thim who ought to be there hadn't stopped away. But we'll remimber it for 'em."

Down came the weary, weary rain, as the long, slow procession defiled along the slushy roads. A group of beggars was assembled down near the house, who gave vent to their feelings in language that was only measured by gratitude. True for them! It was never known that neighbor's child was ever "broke" on that farm; or that a beggar was ever turned from that door. And many a piece of rusty bacon, hanging from the ceiling, and many a huge semicircle of griddle cake disappeared in the wallets of the indigent, to the consternation of Nancy, who crossed herself devoutly and prayed Heaven to guard the house against the depredations of the "good people."

Down still came the rain, when the lonely procession reached the Abbey grounds. But no one heeded, except to repeat the distich:

> Happy is the bride the sun shines on!
> Happy are the dead the rain rains on!

When the coffin was lifted from the bier onto the shoulders of the men, among whom there was heated rivalry for the honor, the cortège, instead of moving directly to the Abbey across a smooth pathway, made a circular detour around the entire graveyard. This entailed much discomfort on priests and people, for the high grass was sodden with rain, and the nettles and hemlocks threw a spray of crystal drops on the passers-by. And down into hollows, and over the crests of graves, and stumbling against fallen tombstones, and falling into pits, the priests and bearers went on, whilst the mournful *Miserere* was carried out in strong currents of wind and rain across the landscape, or echoed sadly over the graves of thirty generations of the dead. No matter. It was the custom of the land, and no power on earth could change the tradition of the most conservative people on earth. And for the hundredth time Luke Delmege concluded that there was but little use in attempt-

ing to transplant foreign civilizations here. This race must create or develop a civilization peculiarly its own.

When the circle of priests was completed around the open grave, the Canon resumed the funeral service. Luke stood near him and held his umbrella over the old man's bare head. Just before the *Benedictus*, as that glorious antiphon, *Ego sum Resurrectio et Vita*, was being chanted, Luke resigned his umbrella to a young priest standing near and went over and stood by his father, who, bowed and sorrow-stricken, was gazing mournfully into the open grave. And here a sight met his eyes which was a shock, and then—a revelation. The gloom which overhung the whole proceedings had deepened in his soul into a strange overpowering melancholy, which the leaden skies and the weeping landscape intensified. All through the Office in the church he had tried to close the eyes of his mind to its terrible significance. The mournful music of the Psalms, with their alternate cadences of grief and hope—now sinking almost into despair, and then soaring aloft into almost an exaltation that seemed to presume too much on the Eternal—did not affect him quite as deeply as the lessons from the Book of Job, which, read slowly and solemnly by dignified priests, seemed to sound as the death-bell of poor humanity. And all that he had ever read in the poetry of mankind blended and mingled with the inspired threnodies of the man in the land of Hus; and it was all, all about the nothingness of man and his momentary existence on this planet.

> Remember, I beseech Thee, that Thou hast made me as the clay; and Thou wilt bring me into the dust again. Hast thou not milked me as milk, and curdled me as cheese? Against a leaf that is carried away by the wind, Thou showest Thy power; and Thou pursuest a dry straw. Who cometh forth like a flower, and is destroyed, and fleeth as a shadow, and never continueth in the same state. I should have been as if I had not been, carried from the womb to the grave.

And—

> A little soul for a little holds up the corpse which is man.

And—

> They wrought with weeping and laughter,
> And fashioned with loathing and love;
> With life before and after,
> And death beneath and above;
> For a day and a night and a morrow,
> That his strength might endure for a span,

With travail and heavy sorrow,
The holy spirit of man.

Not a word about the "perfect man" that is to be, or his immortality on this his little theatre! Not a word about the "deity in embryo," or the "slumbering godhead." He shall pass! he shall pass! That is all!

The grave was dug close beneath the great northern window of the Abbey, which almost filled the entire gable, its slender shafts holding aloft, like the stems of candelabra, the beautiful tracery that spread itself into flame shapes, terminating in one sharp jet at the apex. The floor of the Abbey had been raised, in the course of centuries, six or seven feet, for only the curved arches of the sedilia were visible in the side walls; and Luke, staring into the open grave, saw that it was lined on all sides with human remains. Brown bare skulls filled every inch of its walls; and here, tossed also on the grass were, fragments and shells that once held together the little pulp that makes man's body. Some one, pitying the people, had ordered the coffin to be lowered; and the rude laborer who acted as sexton had caught up a handful of earth-stained bones and flung them into the grave as carelessly as a woman flings a handful of twigs on her fire. Then he lightly kicked a large round skull after them. It fell with a heavy thud on the coffin, turned up its ghastly visage and grinned, rolled over in another somersault, and was finally jammed between the angle of the coffin and the brown walls of the grave. There it leered up hideously at the indifferent spectators. Luke felt sick. Here was the end of all his youthful dreams. There lay the little god of this planet. And his dream of Humanity was buried in that grave, where Dagon lay dismembered before the face of the living God!

Luke had been quite unconscious of the singing of the *Benedictus*, so absorbed was he in his reverie. He now woke up to hear, in a kind of triumphant pæan, the words:

Visitavit nos, Oriens ex Alto!

The words seemed to unlock the secrets of the grave, and to open up the far vistas that lay before the fallen race. *Oriens ex Alto! Oriens ex Alto!* The far visions of the prophets—the proximate revelation to the Father of the Precursor—the mighty

apparition of the Sacred Humanity seemed to hover over that charnelhouse of bones; and Luke saw, what long ago he had maintained as a theological thesis in the halls of Maynooth, that there is but one, and can be but one, perfected Humanity; and this it is that shall lift the whole race into Itself, drawing the certainties of eternity from the doubts of time, and out of the despair of earth, deriving the hope and the bliss of heaven. "Seek ye the man in God."

The aged father, stooped with years and sorrow, hung over the grave to the end. Then Luke gently raised him, and offering the feeble limbs the support of his strong arm, they moved towards the Abbey entrance. All else had gone; but there lingered a small group of peasants at the gate that led into the inclosure. They, too, were sodden with wet and damp, and tiny rivulets of rain ran down from their felt hats. Luke, with his head stooped in sorrow, was about to pass them without noticing them, when one stepped forward shyly and held out his rough hand.

"We kem to tell you, Father Luke," he said, "that we are sorry for your throuble."

Luke grasped his hand, but looked bewildered at the speaker.

"I'm James McLoughlin," the latter said; "you remimber, yer reverence, where we had the little dissinsion, you know?"

Then Luke remembered his former parishioners, who had given him all the trouble, and had procured his dismissal from their parish. The poor fellows, anxious to make up for past delinquency, had come across the country from a great distance to testify their respect. As Luke did not immediately respond, they thought he was resentful.

"We thought that bygones should be bygones, yer reverence," said James McLoughlin, "and we kem—"

"Don't speak of it, my dear fellow," said Luke. "I have long since forgotten and forgiven everything. And I'm infinitely obliged to you for your kindness in coming so far on such a day. Father, these are my former parishioners, who have come miles from home to attend mother's funeral."

And they had to go back to Lisnalee and were well entertained there. And there is some reason to fear that the statutes of the diocese were ruthlessly broken and Luke made no protest.

ECCLESIASTICAL CHRONOLOGY—December 15, 1900–June 15, 1901.

DECEMBER, 1900.

19. Preconization of the Most Rev. John J. Keane, D.D., Archbishop of Dubuque, Iowa, at the Secret Consistory.

20. A body of 240 Mexican pilgrims received in papal audience.

24. Solemn Closing of the Jubilee Gate of the Vatican Basilica by His Holiness Leo XIII.

25. The Right Rev. John Monaghan, D.D., Bishop of Wilmington, received in papal audience.

26. Holy Cross College, Boston, Mass., registered by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York.

29. Joint Pastoral Letter of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the Bishops of England, on the Church and Liberal Catholicism.

Degree of "Doctor of Literature" conferred by the University of London upon the Rev. Michael Maher, S.J., the note of "special excellence" being affixed to his work on *Psychology*.

JANUARY, 1901.

1. Midnight Mass of Homage throughout the Catholic universe in honor of our Lord Jesus Christ, Redeemer of the world.

3. His Eminence, Cardinal Herbert Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster, received in papal audience.

4. His Eminence, Cardinal Francis Satolli, appointed Protector of the Dominican Sisters of the Third Order of the Congregation of the Rosary, of the United States.

6. Death of the Right Rev. Michael Wigger, D.D., Bishop of Newark, N. J.

8. A body of English pilgrims received in papal audience. Memorable address by the Duke of Norfolk.

11. Death of the Right Rev. Joseph Byrne, D.D., Bishop of Bathurst, Australia.

15. Installation and investiture with the pallium of the Most Rev. James A. Smith, D.D., Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh, Scotland.

Death of the Right Rev. Anthony Gaughran, O.M.I., D.D.,

titular Bishop of Priene, Vicar Apostolic of Orange River Colony, South Africa.

21. The Right Rev. B. J. MacQuaid, D.D., Bishop of Rochester, N. Y., received in papal audience.

22. S. Congregation of Rites examines the two miracles proposed for the Canonization of the Blessed Louis Mary Chanel, Marist Father, Proto-martyr of Oceanica.

23. The Right Rev. John Bilsborrow, D.D., Bishop of Salford, England, received in papal audience.

25. Death of His Eminence, Cardinal Sebastian Galeati, Archbishop of Ravenna; born February 8, 1822; created cardinal June 23, 1890.

27. Dedication of the Cathedral of St. Mary's, Covington, Ky., by Archbishop Elder.

28. Catholic Converts' League, organized, under presidency of Dr. Benjamin F. De Costa, at the Catholic Club, New York.

30. His Excellency, Monsignor J. Granito Pignatelli di Belmonte, Papal Nuncio at Brussels, commissioned to convey to King Edward VII the Sovereign Pontiff's condolence on the death of Queen Victoria, and congratulations on his accession to the throne.

Announcement by the Canadian Government that there is no State Church in Canada.

FEBRUARY.

5. Ordinary session of the S. Congregation of Rites: Concession and approbation of Office and Mass in honor of Blessed J. B. de la Salle, Founder of the Brothers of the Christian Schools; the same in regard to the Little Office of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; also approbation of the rite for the Blessing of the Lilies in honor of St. Anthony of Padua, for insertion in the Ritual of the Order of Minors.

11. Letter of His Holiness, Leo XIII, on Liberal Catholicism, addressed to the English Hierarchy.

Foundation-stone of the new cathedral, Christchurch, N. Z., Australasia.

12. His Eminence, Cardinal Herbert Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster, received in papal audience.

The Rev. Louis Malfatti, Carmelite, appointed Consultor of the S. Congregation of Propaganda for both Rites.

13. Solemn protest sent to the British Lord Chancellor by the Catholic Peers, against the Royal Declaration against Transubstantiation, made by King Edward VII at the opening of Parliament.

14. Oxford Union, Oxford University, England, carried by 73 against 26 votes, the following resolution: "That this House views with satisfaction the establishment in Ireland of a State-aided Roman Catholic University."

15. The Right Rev. Francis Xavier Cloutier, D.D., Bishop of Three Rivers, Canada, received in papal audience.

21. The Right Rev. James Corbett, D.D., Bishop of Sale, Australia, received in papal audience.

22. Supreme Court of Illinois decides that property of religious and educational institutions is subject to taxation under certain conditions.

24. His Eminence, Cardinal James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, lays before the President of the United States names of candidates for chaplaincies in the army.

26. General session of the S. Congregation of Rites examines the heroism of the virtues of the Venerable Servant of God, Emily de Rodat, Foundress of the Sisters of the Holy Family.

MARCH.

1. Canadian Parliament adopted by 125 to 19 votes a resolution for the amendment of the offensive Royal Declaration against Transubstantiation, made by King Edward VII at the opening of British Parliament.

2. Celebration of the ninety-first anniversary of his birth and the twenty-third of his coronation, by His Holiness, Leo XIII.

11. An Act to repeal the oath against Roman Catholic Doctrines introduced in the British House of Lords by Lord Braye.

12. Ordinary Rotal session of the S. Congregation of Rites examines the validity and relevancy of the Apostolic Process regarding the reputation for sanctity and for miracles *in genere* of the Venerable Michael le Nobletz, Secular Priest and Missionary; also the observance of *non cultus* towards the Venerable Caesar Sportelli, C.SS.R.

20. Ground broken at Brentwood, L. I., N. Y., for new Convent of the Sisters of St. Joseph, by Bishop McDonnell, of Brooklyn.

St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., empowered by Pontifical Brief to confer Degrees in Philosophy and Theology.

21. On motion of the British Premier, appointment of committee to consider Declaration required of the Sovereign on his accession, by the Bill of Rights (Will. III, cap. 2, sec. 1). Irish Parliamentary Party object to the terms as unsatisfactory.

26. Death of the Right Rev. John Sweeney, D.D., Bishop of St. John, N. B., Canada.

Count Stanislas Colacicchi appointed to carry official news of promotion to Cardinalate of Archbishop Martinelli, Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

30. Supreme Court of Montreal declares the validity before the law of the marriage of two Catholics solemnized by Protestant minister, in the Delpit case.

APRIL.

6. Mgr. Reginald Pius de Raymond appointed to present the Cardinal's biretta to His Excellency, Cardinal Martinelli.

10. Third annual conference of the Catholic Colleges of America, in session in Chicago, Ill.

The Right Rev. Monsignor Kelly, Rector of the Irish College, Rome, appointed Coadjutor to the Archbishop of Sydney, Australia, *cum jure successionis.*

11. Ecclesiastical Court in session at Baltimore relative to the Beatification of the Rev. Xavier Seelos, formerly of New Orleans.

14. The Most Rev. P. L. Chapelle, D.D., Archbishop of New Orleans, Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and the Philippine Islands, sails for Rome to make report to the Vatican.

15. Death of the Right Rev. Monsignor James McMahon, at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

The Most Rev. Thomas Fennelly, D.D., appointed Coadjutor Bishop to the Archbishop of Cashel, *cum jure successionis.*

At the private Consistory the following created Cardinals: Mgr. Sanminiatelli-Zabarella, Mgr. Gennari, Mgr. Della Volpe, Mgr. Cavagnis, Mgr. Tripepi, Mgr. Dell' Olio, Mgr. Boschi, Mgr.

Bacilieri, Mgr. Riboldi, Mgr. Martinelli, Mgr. Kniaz de Kolzielsko Puzyna and Mgr. de Skrbensky.

17. Investiture with the pallium of the Most Rev. John J. Keane, D.D., Archbishop of Dubuque, Iowa, by His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons.

23. Anti-preparatory session of the S. Congregation of Rites examines the two miracles proposed for the Canonization of the Blessed John Gabriel Perboyre, Martyr, Priest of the Mission.

24. The Right Rev. John J. O'Connor, D.D., appointed Bishop of Newark, N. J.;[1] the Right Rev. William H. O'Connell, D.D., Rector of the North American College, Rome, appointed Bishop of Portland, Me.

Committee appointed in Rome for the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Pontificate of His Holiness. Leo XIII.

29. Erection of new See of Altoona, Pa., and appointment of the Right Rev. Monsignor E. A. Garvey as its first Bishop.[2]

MAY.

1. Consecration of the Right Rev. Angus Macfarlane, D.D., Bishop of Dunkeld, Scotland.

Consecration of the Pro-Cathedral, Kensington, London, England, by Bishop Brindle, D.S.O.

2. The Right Rev. R. Lacy, D.D., Bishop of Middlesbrough, and the Right Rev. W. Gordon, D.D., Bishop of Leeds, England, received in papal audience.

5. Inauguration of the Early Mass on Sundays, granted by special privilege for night-workers, at 2.30 A.M., at St. Andrew's Church, New York.

8. His Excellency, Cardinal Sebastian Martinelli, titular Archbishop of Ephesus, Delegate Apostolic to the United States, received at the hands of His Eminence, Cardinal James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, the red biretta, at Baltimore.

11. Centenary of the institution of the Pontifical Noble Guards by Pope Pius VII.

[1] Official notice has not yet reached U. S.

[2] Official notice of erection and appointment not yet received.

12. Departure of Cardinal Gibbons for Rome.

The Right Rev. Henry O'Neill, D.D., appointed Bishop of Dromore, Ireland.

15. The Hon. Bourke Cockran receives at the hands of Archbishop Corrigan the *Laetare* Medal of the University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

19. Consecration of the Right Rev. William H. O'Connell, D.D., Bishop of Portland, Me., in the Church of St. John Lateran, Rome, by Cardinal Satolli.

20–23. Conference of Catholic Headmasters of Colleges in England, at Ushaw, Durham, England.

The Right Rev. James Bellord, D.D., titular Bishop of Milevis, resigns the Vicariate Apostolic of Gibraltar.

24. Death of the Right Rev. L. Z. Moreau, D.D., Bishop of St. Hyacinthe, Canada.

29. The Most Rev. Peter Bourgade, D.D., Archbishop of Santa Fe, and the Right Rev. Thomas Heslin, D.D., Bishop of Natchez, New Orleans, received in papal audience.

31. Letter of the Right Rev. Edward G. Bagshawe, D.D., Administrator Apostolic of the diocese of Nottingham, England, announces to the clergy the Holy See's acceptance of his resignation as bishop of the diocese.

JUNE.

4. The Right Rev. E. G. Bagshawe, D.D., Administrator Apostolic of the diocese of Nottingham, received in papal audience.

Mgr. Cagiano de Azevedo appointed Majordomo of His Holiness, and Mgr. Bisleti, Master di Camera.

9. Consecration of the Most Rev. Thomas Fennelly, D.D., titular Bishop of Ostracene, Coadjutor of the Archbishop of Cashel, Ireland.

14. The Rev. Thomas F. Kennedy, D.D., LL.D., appointed Rector of the North American College, Rome.[3]

[3] June 17. Papal ratification of appointment. Document not yet received.

Analecta.

E S. CONGREGATIONE PROPAGANDAE FIDEI.

I.

PRIVILEGIUM CONCEDENDI GRADUS ACADEMICOS IN SEMINARIO ROFFENSI.

Illme. ac Rme. Domine,

Dum Amplitudo Tua Romae nuper versaretur pro visitatione SS. Liminum App. amplam relationem huic S. Congregationi praesentavit circa statum sui Seminarii S. Bernardi in ista diœcesi Roffensi, enixe rogans ut eidem a Sanctitate Sua privilegium concederetur conferendi gradus academicos in Theologica et Philosophica facultate.

Sanctitas Sua, cui haec petitio oblata fuit, valde gavisa est de florenti statu praedicti Seminarii, et jucundissimum mihi est tibi significare eamdem Sanctitatem Suam, attenta etiam singulari commendatione tum Metropolitani Archiepiscopi Neo-Eboracensis, tum aliorum Episcoporum, tuas supplices preces benigne accepisse et imploratum privilegium praefato Seminario auctoritate sua concessisse. Hisce adnexum Amplitudini Tuae transmitto relativum Breve Pontificium, et interim Deum rogo ut Te diu sospitem servet. A. T. addictissimus Servus,

M. *Card.* LEDOCHOWSKI,

Romae, 23 Aprili 1901. ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secrius.*

R. P. D. BERNARDO MACQUAID,
Episcopo Roffensi.

LEO PP. XIII.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Romani Pontifices Sacrarum Disciplinarum custodes et vindices, quae in ipsarum bonum evadant atque incrementum paterno studio comparant. Cum itaque venerabilis Frater Bernardus MacQuaid, Episcopus Roffensis in Statibus Fœderatis Americae Septentrionalis, instanter a Nobis petierit per tramitem Congregationis de Propaganda Fide pro Diœcesano S. Bernardi Seminario facultatem conferendi gradus Academicos in facultate tum Theologica tum Philosophica, Nos, collatis consiliis cum venerabilibus Frat. Nris. S. R. E. Cardinalibus negotiis ut supra Propagandae Fidei praepositis, attentisque expositis, ac singulari commendatione tum Metropolitani Archiepiscopi Neo-Eboracensis tum aliorum Episcoporum, Antistitis memorati preces benigne excipiendas existimavimus. Quae cum ita sint, omnes ac singulos, quibus hae litterae Nostrae favent, peculiari benevolentia complectentes et a quibusvis excommunicationis, suspensionis et interdicti aliisque ecclesiasticis sententiis, censuris et pœnis, si quas forte incurrerint, huius tantum rei gratia, absolventes et absolutos fore censentes, Motuproprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione Nostris, de apostolicae potestatis plenitudine praesentium vi perpetuumque in modum nunc et pro tempore existenti Ordinario Roffensi facultatem facimus conferendi gradus Academicos in Sacra Theologia et in Philosophia alumnis Seminarii Diœcesani S. Bernardi qui de sua probitate et doctrina experimenta praebuerint, his servatis adamussim conditionibus et legibus. I. Ut unusquisque ex candidatis in supradicto Seminario, si de Philosophia agatur, saltem per unum annum pro baccalaureatu, per duos annos pro prolytatu, per tres annos pro Doctoratus laurea Philosophicis doctrinis vacaverit: si vero de Theologia sermo sit, saltem per duos annos pro baccalaureatu, per tres pro prolytatu, per quatuor pro Doctoratus laurea huic sacrae disciplinae operam dederit. II. Ut opportunum subierit examen in rebus philosophicis ac theologicis orale tantum pro gradibus inferioribus, orale et scriptum pro Doctoratu, praeside Episcopo aut eius Vicario Generali vel alio sacerdote ab eodem Ordinario deputando, et coram tribus saltem professoribus. III. Ut postquam candidatorum quisque dignus habitus fuerit qui laurea decoretur is in manibus Episcopi vel eius ut supra Delegati fidei

professionem iuxta formam a fe: re: Pio PP. IV Præd. Nro. praescriptam, iis additis quae in exemplari edito in vim decreti Congregationis Tridentini Concilii decretis interpretandis praepositae sub die XX Ianuarii anno MDCCCLXXVII atque heic adiecto continentur, rite emittere teneatur. His rite persolutis studiorumque curriculo emenso candidatus ab Episcopo vel eius vices-gerente apostolica Nostra auctoritate creabitur declarabitur in Philosophica, aut respective in Theologica facultate Doctor et Magister, collatis illi omnibus et singulis viribus ac privilegiis quibus alii sic promoti tam in athenaeo almae huius Urbis Nostrae quam in totius Orbis studiorum Universitatibus de iure vel consuetudine aut alias quomodolibet potiuntur et gaudent. Decernentes praesentes litteras semper firmas, validas et efficaces existere ac fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere, ac illis ad quos spectat et pro tempore quandocumque spectabit in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari sicque in praemissis per quoscumque iudices ordinarios et delegatos iudicari ac definiri debere, ac irritum et inane si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque. Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XX Martii MDCCCCI Pontificatus Nostri Anno vigesimo quarto.

L. ✝ S. ALOIS. *Card.* MACCHI.

II.

DUBIA CIRCA TRANSMISS. OLEORUM SACR. AD MISSIONARIOS.

Illme ac Rme. Domine,

Receptae sunt litterae, quibus A. Tua duo sequentia dubia proponebat circa transmissionem Oleorum sacrorum ad Missionarios, nempe—

1° Licetne sacra Olea ab Episcopo consecrata per societatem mercatoriam "The Express" ad sacerdotes transmittere?

2° Licetne illa sacra Olea ad sacerdotes mittere per viros laicos, quo sacerdotum convenientiae valde consulatur?

Cum vero hujusmodi dubia ad supremam Congregationem S. Officii transmissa fuerint, haec sequens decretum die 1 volventis mensis Maii edidit, quod a Sanctitate Sua in sequenti Audientia confirmatum fuit, scilicet—Ad 1^{um} Non licere; ad 2^{um} Deficienti-

bus Clericis, affirmative, modo constet de laicorum, qui ad id designantur, fidelitate.

A. T. addictissimus Servus,
M. *Card.* LEDOCHOWSKI,
Romae, 15 Maii 1901. ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secrius.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

VARIA SOLVUNTUR DUBIA CIRCA MISSAE CELEBRATIONEM IN NAVI.

Hodiernus Magister Caeremoniarum Dioecesis Vicensis in Hispania, rogatus a Capellano maiore cuisdam Societatis navigationis, de consensu Rmi sui Episcopi, a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione sequentium Dubiorum solutionem humillime expostulavit:

I. Utrum Episcopi possint sacerdotibus suae Dioecesis facultatem concedere ut navigantes Missam in altari in navi erecto celebrare valeant?

II. Utrum hanc ipsam facultatem tribuere possint omnibus sacerdotibus Episcopi in quorum Dioecesi adsint portus maris?

III. Utrum missionarii apostolici vi huius tituli valeant in navi celebrare absque licentia Sedis Apostolicae?

IV. Utrum sacerdotes qui privilegio fruuntur celebrandi ubique, valeant, vi huius privilegii, in navi celebrare absque speciali Indulto Apostolico?

V. Utrum capellae navium aut altaria in ipsis navibus erecta pro sacro litando debeant considerari ut Orat. privata vel publica.

VI. Utrum in praedictis altaribus valeant celebrari Missae de Requie concessae per Decreta 3903 *Aucto* diei S. Iunii 1896 ad II, et 3944 *Romana* diei 12 Ianuarii 1897?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae omnibusque rite perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad *I. II. III.* et *IV. Negative.*

Ad *V. Si Capella locum fixum habeat in navi, uti publica pro navigantibus habenda est: secus neque publica est, neque privata, sed habetur uti altare portatile.* Ad *VI. Affirmative.*

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 4 Martii 1901.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*
L. ✝ S. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secr.*

Conferences.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—S. CONGREGATION OF PROPAGANDA:

1. Letter of His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, to the Right Reverend Bishop of Rochester, communicating the Pontifical Brief authorizing St. Bernard's Seminary to grant degrees in Philosophy and Theology. The text of the Brief is also given.

2. Letter communicating to the Right Rev. Bishop of Leavenworth the decision of the Holy Office that the Sacred Oils may not be sent through express companies.

II.—S. CONGREGATION OF RITES answers certain questions regarding the celebration of Mass aboard ship.

THE SUGGESTION OF RAILWAY CHAPELS.

To the Editor AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Permit me to offer a few comments on the article entitled "Railway Chapels," in the May number of the REVIEW. The fact that I am doing mission work in a State (Nevada), in which, if in any, your suggestion would be feasible, leads me to state the reasons which in my opinion make it impracticable.

The idea of a chapel car is opposed to the Catholic idea of a place of worship. The house of God is, if anything, a permanent structure in a determined place,—"*Hic domus Dei est, et porta coeli; et vocabitur aula Dei;*" again,—"*Bene fundata est domus Domini super firmam petram,*" not upon wheels.

The Catholic place of worship, no matter how humble it may be, is known as the House of God. The church is a landmark. The people love to visit it, to hear its Angelus bell daily. They are comforted to know that they have the House of God with them, even if it is no more than the stone which Jacob anointed,—"*Ecce tabernaculum Dei cum hominibus et habitabit cum eis.*" These texts taken from the Mass *in Dedicatione Ecclesiae* refer to the material structure.

Moreover, the discipline of the Church is very strict in regard to the place where the Holy Sacrifice is offered. She permits its celebration, it is true, in a private house, where no church is possible; but such a place is generally in a very remote district. Then the best room in the house is used.

I think few, if any, of the Ordinaries of this country would allow a priest to celebrate Mass in a "railway chapel." And were the matter referred to the Congregation of Rites it would, I think, most likely be prohibited.

Again, a chapel car will never appeal to Catholics. It has no association of reverence. If we find it difficult to get some to attend Mass in a church, how will it be with the car?

The people, as a rule, will not adopt the "Funeral Car," because it is not in accordance with the respect and solemnity due the obsequies of the dead.

If we cannot brook the idea of a railway car for a dead body, can we welcome the suggestion of a railway car for the Living Sacrifice?

To me the very mention of a chapel car suggests "refrigerator car," or a moving menagerie. We were not ordained to be railroad conductors (even if we do lead souls to the Kingdom of Heaven); and life is too short to be occupied in keeping tramps from stealing rides on "railway chapels."

The idea is a fad and a grotesque one. The price of a car ($7,000.00) would build twice as many chapels as one priest ever has to attend. Why "rent a car"? Why not a hall? It is more becoming.

The "railroad chapel" might do to evade taxation where churches are taxed. The article which you quote says "the cars remain five or six weeks at a time in one place." That is the Protestant idea of evangelization,—to make a great "hurrah" and "convert" wholesale, and then leave the converts to their own devices.

Why do priests spend hours in the saddle (fasting)? Is it not

that the people may have Mass every Sunday or on alternate Sundays?

We never took to the "Gospel Arks" or "Funeral Trolley Cars"—we will never take to the chapel on wheels. Let us sidetrack the idea—and the car. MISSIONARY.

The objections of "Missionary" are not very well taken. No priest would think of using a chapel-car as a substitute for a permanent church. But where a missionary is obliged to say Mass in a public hall or a room in a private dwelling-house which at other times may be the scene of very ungodly doings; or where people are obliged to come long distances, and at hours when no regular means of transportation are provided; or in places whither the priest himself finds it difficult to carry vestments and altar belongings, not to speak of long drives, impassable roads over which he must travel, fasting in season and out of season,—in such cases a chapel on wheels is as much an advantage as a neat little church within people's reach. Nor is reverent worship in a tidy, well-provided car in mission districts likely to meet the disapproval of the ecclesiastical authorities, any more than do the chapel-boats which ply on some of our lakes and rivers, to provide Sunday service for the coast population.

Catholic people are rightly opposed to "funeral cars" as a regular substitute for the solemn cortège of the hearse; but it would be absurd to argue that therefore the dead should never be transported by steam cars, but be moved by horse traction, at any inconvenience.

Our protesting Missionary correspondent asks, "Why do priests spend hours in the saddle (fasting)?" The simple answer is: Because they have no convenient railway service at command. A chapel-car would save them the trouble of keeping a horse, as well as the inconvenience of long rides.

Finally, our Reverend correspondent objects that the chapel-car is a "Protestant idea." Well, what of it—so long as the missionary who preaches in it keeps to soundly Catholic doctrine and encourages the people to come and hear the same? We do not see any harm in having a Protestant suggest a good way to do it, or even in having a Protestant build the chapel-car, and move it, free of charge, for Catholics. It is one way of getting him the grace of conversion.

TEACHERS OF CATECHISM AND THEIR CRITICS.

In a recent notice of Father Klauder's revised edition of the Baltimore Catechism we offered some apology for certain defects in the Notes and Explanations given by the author. The apology was prompted by a severe criticism in other quarters which demanded the withdrawal of the book from the market, as it was likely to prove a serious injury to the Catholic training of our children. The charge was not a light one, even if we set aside the loss that would accrue to a publisher who took up the matter in good faith; for the Catechism bears the *nihil obstat* of the Ordinary and the *imprimatur* of the Metropolitan whose censorship allows the book to circulate without restriction.

The objections raised against Klauder's Catechism may be categorized as follows: The English is "prehistoric;" the definitions are often tautological; there is frequent "confusion of cause and effect." To this we should add that Father Klauder uses terms which often convey only a partial sense of the synonym, and that some of his expressions may be so construed as to mean what they should not mean. Here are a few of the most glaring instances:

On p. 14, I am assured "I can *become* forever happy"; on p. 32, that "*immediately* means right before." Can it not mean "right after?" In another place *immediately* means "at once, no *time* between"; can it not mean also "no *space* between"? On p. 38, to the information that "Christ instituted the Church" we find appended the explanation that "to *institute* means to get up something." On p. 87 we are advised that "*mutual* means between two"; on p. 89, that "to *consecrate* means to make sacred to"; on p. 41, "*Matters of Faith* means as to what we are to believe. *Matters of Morals* means as to what we are to do." On p. 136 I am asked: "Have I done things behind my parents' back?" etc. "*Delight* is something which gives great joy and pleasure." On p. 42, "*Union* means a uniting, a belonging together." On p. 88, "*Bond* means a joining together." On p. 62, "*The Ministry of the Priests* is whatever they do at the altar and for religion." On p. 92, "The *Angelus Bell* is the ringing of the church bell three times a day."

Now, admitting that these defects are just subject for criticism in a textbook of Christian doctrine, we still believe that the condemnation which would put the book in question on the Index of forbidden reading is overstrained, and that the severity arises largely, if not wholly, from a misconception of the author's purpose when he offers to comment upon or interpret the Catechism for the

young. He wishes to make plain to the child what is difficult to understand in itself. And for that purpose he uses the imperfect word-images which the child has already acquired, bringing its intelligence nearest to the comprehension of what is unknown or otherwise unintelligible to its inexperienced mind. It is *not a process of definitions;* it is rather a work of comparison or of analogy. Such comparisons or analogies are never wholly perfect. The experienced instructor of children, as indeed any thoughtful teacher, must realize that things unintelligible to the young, while they may be impressed on the memory, can only be brought home to the understanding by *beginning the explanation with a term that is already familiar to the child*, and that leads it to a proximate apprehension of the unknown through comparison. The effort of the teacher, as interpreter, is to be directed towards *starting* the imagination (and recording faculty) of the child *from the point of its actual experience*—that is to say, its present habits of feeling and of mind-imagery. These habits of feeling and mind-imagery may not be philosophically correct, or even true; still they are facts and factors of a comparison that does not necessarily mean perfect likeness or similarity in every element. Most of our teaching of children begins in this way, and the analogies which we make use of with them are never free from imperfection. If they were, we should not need the helps of their interpretation.

To say of such a commentary that the English is here and there immature or what the critic calls "prehistoric," is no ground for a serious charge against its utility or its orthodoxy. The English which most sensible and educated mothers speak to their little ones with a view to gradual and future improvement is of necessity more or less "prehistoric," because the child is not at once up to the age in which it is born. The most successful teacher will prefer the use of homely and childish phrases, though they are inaccurate from the very nature of the case, and unetymological; yet they have some definite meaning for the child, and bring its mind nearer to the comprehension of certain truths of faith not clear from the terms of the Catechism. In other words, the primitive forms of expression which alone the child comprehends, furnish the teacher a method of imparting knowledge. They are not scientifically exact definitions such as we look for in the

making of a dictionary. It is not therefore a question of philosophically correct language—which would serve no purpose with a child who does not comprehend the exact terms—but a question of setting the child to think by starting its imagination at a point where it is capable of grasping, or liable to catch, the comparison that leads it to correct conception. The criticism which finds fault with the statement made to a child that "*Trinity* means *three together*," simply ignores the fact that to the average child "three together" is the nearest expression that will for the moment give to it an adequate notion of what is meant by trinity. And to say that a teacher who so speaks to the child is teaching it heresy, since a theologian might demonstrate that the phrase is heretical, savors of mere pedantry. The word "immediately" does not always mean "right before"; it might indeed mean "right after," but in the case to which the explanation is applied it could not mean "right after"; and there is no need of diverting the child's attention to elements that lie beyond its present necessity or do not immediately concern the matter in hand.

We do not forget a fact which is indeed most important, and one which no doubt influenced the judgment of the critics of the work under discussion, viz., the danger of impressing upon the child's mind inaccurate notions about matters of faith and morals. But that danger exists only if the child is left without the text of the Catechism which is supposed to be memorized. The author of the commentary seems to have felt the danger and the criticism in this respect when he mentions in his preface that the Notes and Explanations should not be committed to memory by the child. He adds that the word-meanings should be demanded of the pupil: but that could hardly be intended to mean that he wished them to become permanent impressions. The child's notions of real life as it sees them in the management of its playthings and in the fairy tales of the nursery, are not to be discouraged because they might mislead the judgment of the child and remain in its mind as realities.

There is, of course, also the old method of simply memorizing the exact terms of the Catechism, and allowing the mind by a gradual appreciation of their value, attain to the true meaning of

the mysteries and facts of faith that lie beyond the child's comprehension. Of late years, however, more stress has been laid upon the development of the reasoning faculty than upon mere memory records, and thus explanations of catechisms for children have become a necessity of which our parents did not dream.

To sum up what we argue for: it is this, that defects such as are pointed out in Klauder's Catechism are not sufficient ground for the charges based upon them by the critics. Exact grammar, correct etymology, perfect analogy, are desirable, no doubt, in any catechism; but they are not essential in the method that teaches and explains the truths of the catechism; and among the instances pointed out as furnishing charges against Klauder's Catechism there are a number which show that the critics misapprehended the purpose of the commentary. It is a case of proving too much; and the "too much" renders the demand for the suppression of the Catechism unreasonable.

ACADEMIC DEGREES IN THE ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

In another part of this issue of the REVIEW we publish the official Decree of the S. Congregation of Propaganda, together with the Pontifical Brief authorizing the conferring of the customary academic degrees in Philosophy and Theology upon graduates of St. Bernard's Seminary, in the Diocese of Rochester. The Faculty, under the direction of its President, the Right Rev. B. J. MacQuaid, D.D., Bishop of Rochester, wisely provides that applicants for academic honors should submit to a rigorous test which will make the titles a matter of actual merit, and not a mere pretence serving as a substitute for learning.

The subjoined letter issued by the Ordinary and signed by the Faculty of the Seminary makes plain the terms upon which the degrees will be awarded to students who enter upon the theological curriculum.

To whom the Inclosed[1] *Documents may be of Interest:*

As several Bishops and others have asked for a copy of the Pontifical Brief, by virtue of which St. Bernard's Seminary is empowered to grant Degrees in Philosophy

[1] Vd. *Analecta*, pp. 59–61.

and Theology, a copy of this and of an accompanying letter from His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, are inclosed.

It will be noted that the Brief requires at least three Professors to constitute the Examining Boards for Theology and Philosophy to decide upon the merit of candidates for degrees. It is the intention of the Seminary authorities that these Boards shall consist of about ten members for each department, and among the number are to be five bishops and priests, not of the Diocese of Rochester.

The Brief also permits that candidates for the Baccalaureate in Theology may receive this degree after two years, and the Doctorate after four years of study. It is the resolve of the Faculty of St. Bernard's to require four years for the Baccalaureate, and six for the Doctorate. The Brief only states the minimum; the maximum will be determined by the Seminary, with the approval of the Propaganda.

In lengthening the course in Theology the example of Maynooth College is followed. St. Bernard's will also copy Maynooth by providing Tutors from among those who have obtained the Baccalaureate, and who are preparing for the licentiate and doctorate. By a system of repetition of the morning's lectures, under these advanced students, the weaker members of a class will be able to keep up successfully with the regular lectures.

There will be two courses of Theology, the long and the short. The first will be of four years, and will follow the rules laid down in the third Plenary Council of Baltimore, for the government of Theological Seminaries. The second will be of three years' duration, to answer the demands of bishops whose need of priests is so urgent that longer time can not be allowed.

The advanced course for degrees will have three years additional, one for Philosophy and two for Theology.

The aim of St. Bernard's will be twofold. First, to give specially gifted students desirous of advancement, an opportunity to attain to a high standard of intellectual training. Second, to secure to those who may not be able to follow the long course, special attention through the help of tutors, in acquiring satisfactory knowledge of theological studies.

We trust that our humble effort to better and elevate the standard of studies in St. Bernard's Seminary will meet favorable consideration from all interested in the intellectual welfare of the Clergy in the United States.

It will be our duty to present in time to the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda our courses of studies and our rules for the granting of degrees in Philosophy and Theology according to the Pontifical Brief, for endorsement and approval.

It will also be incumbent on us to demonstrate to the Propaganda that the trust reposed in us to advance and broaden Theological and Philosophical Studies in American Seminaries, has not been misplaced.

B. J. MACQUAID, *Bishop of Rochester.*

Rochester, N. Y., May 16, 1901.

Present members of the Teaching Faculty of St. Bernard's Seminary:

REV. J. J. HARTLEY, Professor of Moral Theology.

REV. EDWARD J. HANNA, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology.

REV. OWEN M'GUIRE, D.D., Professor of Fundamental Dogmatic Theology.

REV. ANDREW E. BREEN, D.D., Professor of Exegesis. Introduction to Sacred Scripture and Hebrew.

REV. ANDREW B. MEEHAN, D.D., Professor of Canon Law and Liturgy.

REV. P. P. LIBERT, S.T.B., Professor of Natural Sciences, and Librarian.

REV. M. RYAN, PH.D., Professor of Logic and Ethics.

REV. EDMUND J. WIRTH, PH.D., D.D., Professor of Philosophy.

REV. LUDLOW E. LAPHAM, Professor of English Literature, French and German.

EUGENE BONN, Professor of Ecclesiastical Chant.

Ecclesiastical History is taught by two of the above named Professors, pending the special preparation of the future Professor, now in Europe. An Associate Professor of Scripture will go to Jerusalem in the autumn to study the Oriental Languages and Scriptural Archæology. Homiletics and the delivery of Sermons are taught by the Bishop.

Total number of students during the scholastic year 1900–1901, 110.

CONFESSION AND COMMUNION AT FORTY HOURS' SUFFICES FOR JUBILEE.

Qu.—Will you kindly inform me if the reception of the Sacraments of Penance and of the Blessed Eucharist during the Forty Hours' Adoration occurring during the Jubilee term will satisfy the conditions necessary to gain the Indulgence of the Jubilee and of the Forty Hours' at the same time? Or, in other words, must a person go to confession and to Holy Communion to gain the Indulgence of the Forty Hours', and then go again to gain the Jubilee? Some priests have been discussing the matter, and as we are to have the Devotion of the Forty Hours here shortly, it will be a great benefit to the people in my mission towns if they can avail themselves of the services of the visiting priests at the Forty Hours' Prayer to make their Jubilee confession and Communion. L.

Resp. There can be no doubt that the confession and Communion made on occasion of the Forty Hours' Devotion, *and with the intention of gaining the Jubilee Indulgence*, is valid for the obtaining of the latter, whilst it entitles also to the privileges and indulgences attached to the visits of the Blessed Sacrament, which latter constitute separate obligations.

In the first place, we have the general canon allowing the privilege of gaining several plenary indulgences by one Communion, although confession and Communion are prescribed for each of the indulgences. The old *Decreta Authentica* give the following authority: "*Ad Dubium:* Utrum fideles aut sacerdotes per unicam S. Communionem possint lucrari plures Indulgentias

Plenarias? *Resp.* S. C. I.: Affirmative, ut in dieb. 29 Maii et 15 Dec. 1841. (Die 30 Aug. 1847.)" We find no mention of this answer in the new edition of the *Decreta.* Nevertheless the principle is recognized by all writers of authority on the subject.[1]

As a consequence it is understood that those who are in the habit of receiving the Sacraments weekly may gain all the indulgences to which they apply themselves by performing the specified works, without repeating confession and Communion.

From this rule is excepted the Jubilee Indulgence,[2] which, according to the above cited authorities, requires that confession and Communion be made with the distinct intention of gaining the Jubilee Indulgence.[3] "Confessio autem *in ordine ad Jubilaeum* peragenda erit etiam ab iis qui semel in hebdomada confitendo peccata possunt acquirere omnes quae sint per hebdomadam Indulgentiae Plenariae."

But although the weekly confession and Communion made with a view to gaining whatever indulgences may be obtainable through the good works and prayers habitually performed, does not ordinarily include the Jubilee Indulgence, *the intention of gaining the Jubilee Indulgence determines* the primary purpose of the confession and Communion. This done, the requirement of the Jubilee is complied with, and the same confession and Communion satisfy for all other indulgences according to the general law; and therefore also for the Forty Hours' Devotion.

What makes this plainer still is the fact that in the indult of Extension the only exception mentioned with reference to the obligation of receiving the Sacraments of Penance and the Blessed Eucharist, is the annual duty incumbent upon all professed Catholics.

Hence the reception of the Sacraments at the Forty Hours' Prayer, if performed with the intention of gaining the Jubilee Indulgence (together with all other indulgences applicable under the circumstances through the performance of separate good works and prayers), will suffice for this end.

[1] *Cf.* Melata, *Manuale de Indulg.*, p. 56, Exceptiones n. 2, a; also Beringer, *Ablässe*, p. 73, ed. xi.

[2] *Cf.* Melata, *loc. cit.*

[3] Arrizzoli, Putzer, and others cite a decree from the *Decreta Authentica* which is not, however, found in the late amended edition.

BOOKS OF THE WARS OF JAHWEH AND OF JASHAR.

To the Editor AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In your issue for the month of June, on pp. 609–610, it was my endeavor to show that there is no warrant for the assumption that the "Books of the Wars of Jahweh" and of "Jashar" were once parts of the Bible either as collections of war songs or war records. I maintained, and do still so maintain, that in relation to the "Wars of Jahweh" the text needs emendation, as is indicated by the various codices; and that regarding the book of "Jashar" the interpretation of the Jewish commentators that "Jashar" is the book of Genesis clears away the difficulty.

The Rev. Doctor McCabe made the unsuccessful attempt to refute both these statements by declaring that the rendering of the various MSS. indicate nothing; that they are "probably a mere accident," and that "it makes little difference" whether we adopt one rendering or the other. The only correct statement in Dr. McCabe's communication, and that was "probably a mere accident," is his claim that I attempted or intended to ridicule a style of criticism that would . . . explain away difficulties in a purely arbitrary or subjective fashion;" and that inclination has increased since I read the Doctor's statements.

It is certainly quite unscientific to say that the various renderings indicate nothing and that it makes little difference whether we read על כן or כן, whether we read יאמד or יאמרו. The learned Doctor evidently assumed that in dealing with the utterances of one who does not occupy a professorial chair in a Seminary he is dealing with a person who is not *ein Man von Fach* and whose utterances can be disregarded. I said "the word על כן is meaningless," and Doctor McCabe insists that "Professor Reiner knows very well that על כן is not meaningless." Every Hebraist can see that על כן following the preceding verse is meaningless. Israel left the torrent Zarad and encamped over against Arnon, for Arnon is the border of Moab. "Wherefore it is said . . . as he did in the Red Sea, so will he do in the streams of Arnon." In this connection the word "wherefore" is meaningless, while the word "thus," it is said, or "accordingly," etc., has quite a different meaning.

Again the word יאמר has the meaning in Hebrew of writing, viz., כן יאמר בספר "thus it is written in the book;" but יאמדו has usually the significance of tradition, viz., כן יאמרו חכמנו "thus

was it held by our sages." I beg respectfully to state that my training in Biblical criticism taught me to lay stress upon words, to search for the reason of the various renderings, and to discriminate between the various MSS., and I am not disposed to disregard that training to please even so learned a man as Doctor McCabe.

When I notice, however, the treatment which the Jewish commentators receive at the hands of Doctor McCabe, I am not at all surprised at his doubt that an amateur like myself can have anything "serious" to offer. But "as the passage . . . is of great interest and difficulty," to use the Doctor's own words, I will venture to offer my emendation of the text, and leave it to those competent to judge whether it is "a serious one" or not.

The word על is to be omitted, for it only multiplies the difficulties already existing. Instead of יאמר, I read with 84 K. יאמרו. The word כספר is probably a corruption of the word הספרים. The ם and י were found omitted, which is not unusual in MSS, and certainly not in the Old Testament. The Jewish editor, puzzled what to do with the word חספר, made of it בספר. The text would then read in its amended form thus כו יאמרו הספרים מלחמת יהוה and translate: "Thus related the writers of the Wars of Jahweh," and it may mean that those who recorded the Wars of Israel, which were Jahweh's wars, had reference to the writer in Deuteronomy 2 : 9.

At all events this rendering explains the use of יאמרו by 84 K.; we get rid of the clumsy word על, and the whole text becomes intelligible without taking refuge in the wholly arbitrary and rather dangerous assumption that certain books in the Bible were lost.

As for "the Book of the Just," the poor ignorant Jewish commentators receive the gracious assurance from Dr. McCabe that he does not mean "to be hard on them"; that far back in the dark ages of Biblical exegesis, when the nations waited for the coming of Driver, Cheyney, Wellhausen, Duhm, Robertson Smith, Knabenbauer, Hummelauer, and last, but not least, Dr. McCabe, the Jewish commentators "perhaps did as well as they could under the circumstances." And in order "to give us a very fair idea of the intelligence and value of those commentators," the learned Doctor exclaims in triumph: "Is David's lament over Saul and Jonathan really to be found in the Book of Genesis?"

As a layman and, may I say, as a respectable "joker," that is, as an amateur, I crave pardon of the learned Doctor, and the many learned readers of the REVIEW, when I make bold to say that such

sweeping remarks do not impress me with the Doctor's familiarity with Jewish commentators or rabbinical literature generally. The commentators whom I quoted do not belong to the class of מנידים, and their expositions are not דרשות of whom a scholar may boldly say that "as a rule their puerilities and ineptitudes are almost beyond conception." These commentators have largely paved the way for much that is praised as learned criticism in our days. Dr. McCabe is evidently not aware that the rendering of the Vulgate, in Numb. 21: 14, the text of the "Wars of Jahweh," is quite Jewish indeed.

Targum: דעבד יי על ימא דסוף

Rashi: כלומר את אשר יהב להם והרבה נסים בים סוף

Vulgate: "Sicut fecit in Mari Rubro, sic faciet," etc.

Is Dr. McCabe aware that in the vexatious and difficult passage in Isaias 7: 8b—not to mention many other passages—Jerome, Eusebius, Procopius, and later Maldonat, Mariana, Tirinus, and Cornelius à Lapide, follow blindly and slavishly "the puerilities and ineptitudes" of Jewish commentators? Does the Doctor know that the Jesuit exegete, Knabenbauer, who rejects these puerilities, and justly so, as a "Nothbehelf der Juden," follows himself the "puerilities" of Seder Olam?

If Doctor McCabe will kindly look more critically at the text "Book of Jashar," he will not laugh to scorn those without whose "ineptitudes" the text remains unexplained. Has it ever occurred to my learned neighbor that the text as it stands is out of place? First, v. 17th commences the Lamentation of David. What possible meaning, therefore, can the words have: "Et praecepit ut docerent filios Juda Arcum," followed by these remarkable words: "sicut scriptum est in Libro Justorum," even if we accept the theory that "Jashar" is a lost book? Again, let it be remembered that Juda was against the reign of Saul, and why mention the "filios Juda" in the Lamentation over Saul? Again, the Vulgate leaves the words of the whole text in brackets, indicating that the text is either to be transposed or omitted. This indication of the Vulgate is confirmed by the great and learned Jewish commentator, Kimchi, who says: כי זה אינו מן הקינה ותחילת הקינה הצבי ישראל—"This is not the commencement of the Lamentation. The words 'the illustrious of Israel are slain' is the opening of the Lament of David."

Now let us transpose this text, and place it right after v. 16, and it will read thus: "And David said to him: Thy blood be upon thy own head," etc., "and he commanded that the children of Judah be

taught the use of the bow, as it is written in the Book of Genesis," making reference to the prophecy of Jacob that Juda will triumph over his enemies (Gen. 49: 8); and then follows the Lament.

Which is the more scientific way of dealing with an obscure passage? To assume without any warrant that a book was lost, and leave the text in a place which even the superficial reader cannot help but feel disturbs the harmony of the Lament and obscures the whole, or to transpose the text and explain it?

Doctor McCabe's position is this: "As the text stands at present it can hardly admit of any other translation than that adopted by the learned Rabbis and Doctors referred to." But the student in the Old Testament is often compelled to amend a text. That is due to many causes known to the student of the Masoretic text. But who are the Rabbis "referred to," whose "puerilities and ineptitudes" he is willing to accept? He did not mention any Rabbis himself, and those I quoted were not permitted within the gates of Overbrook.

To demonstrate of how little value the "puerilities" of those Rabbis are to our modern exegetes, Doctor McCabe, referring to my quotation from Eban Ezra that "the word והב is not a Hebrew word," says that concerning that word it "was given long before by Father Morin and of which Father Thomas Malvenda, who died in 1628, says," etc. "Long before" what or whom? Father Malvenda, the author of *Commentarium in Sacram Scripturam*, was certainly not "long before" Eban Ezra or before the Midrash. Eban Ezra died in the thirteenth century, and Father Malvenda in the seventeenth century.

On the whole I find Doctor McCabe's communication or reply to remarks "to be quite interesting in its way," but its way is the way of Goethe: "Legst du nicht aus, so lege doch unter."

JOHN M. REINER.

Villanova, Pa.

After submitting Professor Reiner's communication to the Rev. Dr. McCabe we received the following reply:

Dear Father.

I think it would be best to publish Professor Reiner's last communication just as he sent it. To have him alter its tone or to soften some of its personal references he might think would interfere with the freedom and force of his argument, and it may be just as well that your readers should have an opportunity of perusing it in what he evidently

deems its best and most appropriate form. I think they will find that it needs all the adventitious help it can get from the little asperities sprinkled through it. As for a reply on my part, it would no doubt be amply sufficient to ask such as may be interested in the matter to read over my former remarks and examine for themselves how far they are met. It may be better, however, for me to make things a little clearer by a few further observations.

I am sorry to find that Dr. Reiner repudiates the suggestion that he was merely joking in his criticism regarding the Books of the Wars of Yahweh and of Jashar. For candidly I think it would have been more to his credit if, as I had supposed, such had really been the case. How was one to know that he meant to be serious? He remarked: "You very properly leave the word על out. The various codices confirm that view." Now, of the hundreds of codices known to Kennicott and De Rossi, not one leaves the word על out. The old translators all had it. The Greek, for instance, translates it by διὰ τοῦτο; St. Jerome has *unde;* the Syriac, ܥܠ ܗܕܐ; while the Chaldee and the Samaritan, both text and translation, retain the word על itself. In the face of such strong external testimony to its genuineness, it would need to be a very compelling reason indeed that would tempt any sane critic to so much as think of leaving it out. But whether the particle be left in or out, I confess myself unable to see how it in any way affects the question of the existence formerly or the non-existence of the book styled the "Wars of Yahweh," and just as little can I appreciate what bearing the solitary reading of 84 Kennicott against all the other codices (they "say" instead of "it is said") has upon the same question.

Dr. Reiner, however, professes to be serious, and favors us at last with his proposed emendation. He would omit the word על, read יאמרו on the authority of 84 Kennicott, and without any authority change the ב of בספר into ה (though the letters are not alike in either the present or the more ancient Hebrew writing), add the letters י and ם, and translate "thus related the writers of the Wars of Jahweh."

I had thought that the object of all this fuss was somehow to safeguard the supposed Mosaic authorship of the passage in question by getting rid at all hazards of a reference to and quotation from a book styled "The Wars of the Lord." If this was the object, the success in its attainment is not very conspicuous, as the proposed emendation makes the author refer, not indeed to "The Book" (literally writing), but to "the writers" of the Wars of Yahweh, thus leaving that question precisely *in statu quo ante.*

Professor Reiner thinks that "Dr. McCabe is evidently not aware that the rendering of the Vulgate in Num. 21: 14, the text of the 'Wars of Jahweh' is quite Jewish indeed;" and he quotes the Targum, Rashi, and the Vulgate. The Vulgate is certainly not indebted to Rashi (the obligation, if any, being, of course, the other way), but is to the Targum, it being the professed object of St. Jerome, as he frequently tells us, not to find fault with or improve upon the older translations, but to show his countrymen exactly what was contained in the Hebrew Scripture, as read and understood by the Jews of his time. It is this professed object of St. Jerome that justifies him in translating the passage in question as he did. Dr. McCabe, it may be stated, had as a matter of fact looked up the passage in the Targum and ascertained its exact agreement with the Vulgate before he wrote a line on the subject. But while St. Jerome was justified by his special purpose in following the interpretation of the Targum, or of the Jews of his time, every Hebraist knows, or ought to know, that that interpretation is itself a mere guess and in fact quite erroneous, the original text, as we have it now, or as it was at any time, simply not admitting of it. This makes it the more surprising that Dr. Reiner should follow the Douay translation, "As he did in the Red Sea, so will he do in the streams of Arnon," without any attempt to amend or alter the text, so as to in any way justify that translation. Speaking of this passage in his former communication, Dr. Reiner told us that "the learned Jewish Rabbis, Drs. Philipson, Landau, Kaempf, as well as Drs. Zunz, Arnheim, Fuerst, and Sachs, are much puzzled what to do with the word והב that they translate *Waheb in Sufah*, and so does the great De Wette." In reference to this I ventured to intimate that this translation was alone correct, and that the key to it had been given long before by Father Morin, adding a brief but significant quotation from Father Malvenda. Commenting on this, the good Doctor asks: "'Long before' what, or whom?" Why, of course, long before the Rabbis and Doctors, Philipson, Landau, Kaempf, . . . the great De Wette gave the translation "Waheb in Sufah." He might have given people credit for knowing that it was not before Eban Esra, or the Midrash. Dr. Reiner has not told us, and I am not yet aware, whether Eban Esra or any of the Midrash writers had previously given a similar translation; but if they had, why so much to their credit. Eban Esra, we are informed, died in the thirteenth century. He must have lived to a great age, then, as he is said to have been born in 1092. The year of his death, as usually given, is 1167, or 1168; but the dates vary somewhat.

Dr. Reiner appears to be very much exercised over Dr. McCabe's opinion of the value of the old Jewish commentators. Well, Dr. McCabe is quite willing to confess that he may have made a mistake. His statement was probably somewhat too general. He makes no pretensions to any extensive acquaintance with Jewish commentators in particular, or rabbinical literature generally. But he has looked into parts of it, and what he has seen has not impressed him favorably; and Dr. Reiner's statement that, "All Jewish commentators agree that the Book of Jashar is the Book of Genesis," tends strongly to deepen that impression. However, I very much doubt if all Jewish commentators do so agree. Dr. Reiner himself hardly intended, I should think, that the "all" should be taken literally. He means probably "all" that he is acquainted with; or not even that, for it is scarcely to be believed that moderns like Philipson, Landau, and the others that he quotes and with whom he appears to be familiar, should entertain the opinion stated. I am unable at present to test the matter; for unfortunately Dr. Reiner's confident statement that the Rabbis "quoted were not permitted within the gates of Overbrook," is more nearly true than most of his other conjectures. Not that they were ever excluded, or that the policy of the Institution is or ever was what the form of expression implies; but that the funds appropriated for the purchase of books are, especially of late years, ridiculously inadequate, and those who have charge of their expenditure accordingly lay them out on works which they deem to be of more immediate necessity or utility. We are not, however, quite as badly off as the Professor seems to think. The works referred to are not indispensable; indeed, unless read with discretion they might in some cases, if we may judge from their apparent effect in the Professor's own case, have rather an injurious effect. If, however, Dr. Reiner, or any of his friends, or others, should be good enough to send us copies of the works referred to, or others of a similar character, they may be assured that they will be thankfully received by the librarian and assigned an honorable place in our library, no matter what strange opinions some of them may contain or advocate. It would take a long article, or rather a series of articles, to give in detail the reasons for my unfavorable opinion of the "old Jewish commentators" as a body, and to state them merely *in globo* would be of little use. Dr. Reiner will, I have no doubt, notwithstanding his general admiration for those worthies, agree with me in repudiating the way in which they deceived their people by interpreting and expounding, as they constantly do, the various

prophecies and the texts of Holy Scripture against Edom, the Sons of Edom, etc., of Rome and the Christian Church. Their fixed *a priori* determination to find nothing, or as little as possible, in the Scriptures of the Old Testament that might favor the claims of our Lord to be the Messiah promised to their fathers, he would probably admit, has had a damaging effect even on their natural intelligence; and I presume he would hardly regard as models of accuracy the statements of Rabbi Johannan and others about the four millions, according to others forty millions ("four hundred myriads, they said to him: Nay, rather, four thousand myriads") slain in the city of Bither, a place that one might walk all around leisurely in, say, twenty minutes to half an hour; or about its containing four hundred colleges, each having four hundred professors, and every professor four hundred disciples of the house of Rabban. Of course, even the most foolish legends and fairy tales may be useful as recording and preserving many words whose meanings would be otherwise unknown; and if we had stories of this kind from the period when Hebrew was still a spoken language, Hebrew philology would be in a much more satisfactory condition than it is, or perhaps ever can be; though the progressive development of grammars and dictionaries, and the more exact study of the sister languages with their comparative wealth of material which the discoveries of our days are continually enlarging, give modern scholars very considerable advantages over their predecessors in this field of labor.

As to the "vexatious and difficult passage in Isaias 7: 8b, I do not think that if, in the solution of a serious chronological difficulty, St. Jerome, Eusebius, and others followed the opinion of the Jewish schools, when no better solution presented itself to them, it, therefore, follows that they accepted them always, or, even on this occasion, *blindly and slavishly;* nor because Christian scholars have been able to extract from the Seder Olam something which they have turned to a good account not thought of by its author, can they therefore be said to follow its puerilities. I do not find, for instance, Father Knabenbauer, or any one like him, solving a difficulty by saying, as the author of Seder Olam does, that "Aran married in his *sixth* year and became after one year the father of Lot and in the following year of Jescha who is Sara."

I will now, as requested, look a little more critically at the text, "Book of Jashar," and then conclude. To shorten matters I will pass over the passage in Joshua and confine myself to that in 2 Sam.

1: 17 ff. The meaning of the word ישר in verse 18 is well ascertained. It means, *straight, right, upright*, and read, as it may be, with different vowel points,[1] *straightness, uprightness*, both in the physical and moral sense of these terms. It is in the singular number, and preceded by the definite article. Instead of the abstract *rightness, uprightness*, in the singular, St. Jerome by metonymy uses the concrete *upright, just* (*justorum*), in the plural, while the Greek follows the original more rigidly, translating it by τοῦ εὐθοῦς; the Syriac has for it in this place *asheer*, but in Joshua: *Theshbuhhotho* (lauds, canticles, psalms); the Chaldee uses for it the word אריתא, usually translated *law*, but not necessarily meaning the *law of Moses*, much less Genesis, except when the word משה, *Moses*, is added. I suspect, however, that the original meaning of אוריתא was the same as ישר and εὐθύς, and that it is probably the synonymous Greek term ὀρθός, or ὄρθιος, adapted to a Chaldee form, Greek having been extensively spoken in Chaldea, and many words borrowed from it by the vernacular during the five or six centuries that preceded the making of this translation or paraphrase. Its meaning of *law* would then be derivative, and would convey the idea, not of binding or obligation, but rather of something that *guides, directs*, or *makes straight*. The word, however, may be from a genuine Semitic root, not otherwise known to us in Aramaic, but represented by the Ethiopic *rathea* or *rethua*, which is the exact equivalent of the Greek and Hebrew words mentioned, as may be seen by consulting the lexicons of Wemmers, Ludolf, or Dillmann, in the last of which especially the meaning is established by an abundance of examples.

If the Jewish doctors or rabbis of St. Jerome's time had thought that the book of Jashar was the book of Genesis, St. Jerome would most likely have known and mentioned the fact. A Hebrew writer of the early part of the ninth century, whose notes on Kings and Paralipomena are printed among the works of Jerome, to whom they were for a time erroneously attributed, and who may be presumed to represent the traditional views of the Jewish schools of his time, writing in Latin and commenting on the title "Book of the Just," tells us that the Just referred to are the prophets Samuel, Gad, and Nathan. It appears, then, that the only authorities, so far as I can

[1] Your readers are, of course, well aware that the points representing the vowels form no part of the text, being added to it by the Masoretes long after the time of St. Jerome.

see, adduced in support of the statement that "all Jewish commentators agree that the book of Jashar is the book of Genesis" are two French rabbis, Raschi and Kimchi, one of the eleventh and the other of the thirteenth century.

Dr. Reiner thinks that the first half of the 18th verse, which the Vulgate and Douay editions, followed by the King James, place in parenthesis, instead of following, should precede the 17th. This would be reasonable, if by the word translated *bow* must be understood the well known weapon of ancient warfare; but even supposing this and making the transposition suggested, I am really as much at a loss to understand how people could ever have persuaded themselves that such a command of David is to be found in Gen. 49: 8 ff., as that his Lamentation over Saul and Jonathan can be read there; and were not the children of Judah acquainted with the use of the bow as a weapon of warfare until the time of David? After transposing the 17th and 18th verses as already stated, Dr. Reiner tells us he would translate the passage thus: "And he (David) commanded that the children of Juda should be taught *the use of the* bow, as it is written in the Book of Genesis." I have italicized four of the words just quoted for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that there is nothing at all corresponding to them in the original. The Vulgate and Douay versions omit them, excepting that the latter inserts the definite article before *bow*. The authorized version of King James first interpolated the whole four, printing, however, the first three in italics to indicate that they were not in the original; from which they have been foisted into modern editions of the Douay without any italics at all. There is no more authority in the original for the inserting of "the use of the" in the King James than for the similar insertion of "the song of the" (bow) in the revised version; though the latter in all probability conveys the true meaning, if the word *bow* is to be retained at all. The word so translated was not found in the text by the Greek translators in the third century before Christ; at least they take no notice of it and have nothing corresponding to it. Recent critics also are strong for its omission, and give good theoretic reasons to account for its having been inserted. It does not alter the meaning, however, and can be retained, if as Gesenius contends, it was the name or title given to David's elegy, an idea favored also by Dr. Reiner's friend, Fuerst.[1]

[1] The absence of the article before קשת (qasheth, the word translated "bow") makes me think that Ewald was probably right in identifying it with the Syriac

It need not be considered strange that David should direct his touching poem to be sung by the children of Judah. It would be in accordance rather with the loyalty and generosity which he had always exhibited to his persecutor, even when completely in his power and at his mercy, as at Engaddi and Zif. It would also be an act of the soundest policy, well calculated to conciliate the friends of Saul both in Judah, where he appears to have been recognized by the great majority as long as he lived, and in the nation generally.

It must have been in a moment of extreme haste and forgetfulness that the Professor sought for some support of his idea in the punctuation of the Vulgate; for, as any one can see, the brackets he speaks of are not square brackets, but the ordinary marks of parenthesis, and of course have not the significance that has been imagined. The rest of verse 18, however, as found in the Douay, and in most editions and some MS. copies of the Vulgate, should be bracketed, or omitted, as not being from St. Jerome, or found in the oldest and best MSS. of his translation, except when added in the margin of some of them by a late hand from a different version.

As the genuine verse 18 is parenthetic, and rightly marked as such in the Vulgate and other editions, the poem undoubtedly begins with verse 19, as we are told has been affirmed by Kimchi; but I was not aware that anyone had ever thought otherwise.

Dr. Reiner appears to have been moved to take up the strange and indefensible position he has occupied, from a desire, or rather anxiety, to avoid what he considers "the wholly arbitrary and rather dangerous assumption that certain books in the Bible were lost." He need have no fears on this head. To hold that certain books in the Bible have been lost is neither an arbitrary nor dangerous assumption, nor indeed an assumption at all; for it is a clearly established fact. I will not attempt to show this at present, for I have already taken up more space than I had intended. If this is not satisfactory to our friend, it is open to him to adopt the opinion, almost universally held, I believe, among Catholics, that an inspired writer may quote, abridge, compile from,

qushtho, the Chaldee *qeshot* or *qushta* and the Arabic *qist*, and regarding it as the indirect or adverbial accusative meaning *correctly*, *accurately*. Driver objects to this that the word in Aramaic always means *truth*, *truthfully*, not *accurately*; to which it may be replied that the word means *truth* in an objective sense, not *truthfully*, but *truly*, and also *equitably*, *rightly*; and apparently also in certain connections *entirely*, *fully*, as well as *evenly*, *equally*. Compare Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 3773; Lane's Arabic-English, and the Beyrouth Arabic-French lexicons *sub vocibus*.

or otherwise use the works of an uninspired author without in any degree impairing thereby the canonicity, sacredness, and inspiration of his own work. The Epistle of St. Jude, for instance, is believed to be inspired, though the Book of Enoch, which it quotes, is not. And Catholics hold the second Book of Maccabees to be canonical and inspired; but I do not know of anyone who has attributed this character to the five books of Jason of Cyrene, now lost, of which, nevertheless, II Maccabees is known to be an abridgment.

L. V. McCABE.

Overbrook, Pa.

DEDICATIO OMNIUM ECCLESIARUM DIOECESIS.

Qu. Will the REVIEW kindly give the rules for the *Dedicatio Omnium Ecclesiarum Dioecesis?* In comparing different "ordos" I find considerable discrepancy in this matter. To illustrate: *Archdiocese of New Orleans*, "Dedic. Omn. Eccl. huj. Dioec. d. l. cl. (cum. Oct. in civitate tantum)"; *Diocese of Indianapolis*, "Annivers. Ded. Oo. Eccl. Consec. hujus Dioeces. dupl. l. cl. cum Oct. (In Eccl. non consecratis sine Oct.)"; *Diocese of Leavenworth*, "Ded. Omn. Eccl. Dioec. dupl. l. cl. cum Oct. in tota dioec. etiam in eccl. non consecratis."

To what are the religious in these dioceses obliged in regard to this *Dedic. Omn. Eccl.?* B. O.

Resp. According to a decision of the S. Congregation of Rites, the rubric as given in the case of the Diocese of Leavenworth, above cited, is the one generally to be observed.

The indult which allows the simultaneous celebration of the dedication of all churches belonging to a community of regulars, or within the jurisdiction of a bishop, is granted for the purpose of establishing uniformity in the liturgical offices, and to avoid the variations of the ordo resulting from the celebration of separate dedication offices in different churches. When, therefore, the indult is granted to an order or a diocese it means, as a rule, that all the clergy within the pastoral jurisdiction of the order or diocese are bound to say the office, irrespective of rank or locality.[1]

It matters not whether a church is consecrated, or dedicated

[1] *Cf.* À Carpo, *Kalend. perpetuum*, cap. II, 9, p. 34, ed. 1875.

only, or whether a priest is serving as pastor or as assistant, or even without any parochial charge.

Those who enjoy this indult are not at liberty to repeat the dedication office of their special church, even if it were the cathedral, since they have fulfilled their obligation by the office "pro omnibus ecclesiis."[2]

A decision cited in the latest edition of the *Decreta Authentica*, with reference to the practice of the Archdiocese of Mechlin,[3] puts what we have said above beyond doubt. It answers categorically the question regarding the extent of the obligation for the diocesan clergy when the *Anniversarium Ded. Ecclesiarum* is granted for the diocesan calendar by indult, making it obligatory for all the clergy, irrespective of the fact that there are churches not consecrated and that some of the clergy are not strictly attached to any church. De Herdt, in his *Praxis*, n. 220, ad. 2, explains the indult in the same sense.

Of course, where there is a special concession (as may be the case for the Archdiocese of New Orleans and the Diocese of Indianapolis), the terms of the particular indult have to be observed.

As regards religious, it is generally understood that, unless they have a particular concession for the celebration of the dedication of the churches of their order and exempting them from the diocesan obligation, they are bound by the general law and its ordinary interpretation; in particular, where they are in charge of missionary parishes under the jurisdiction of the Ordinary of the diocese.

In the United States, and in missionary countries generally, this method of celebrating the dedication offices is an advantage, inasmuch as it simplifies the arrangement of the office. The absence of parochial canons causes more frequent changes of priests from one church to another than in places where the clergy are *stricte adscripti*. Hence arises confusion respecting the regulating of the canonical offices for individual priests who would ordinarily be bound to arrange their calendar in accordance with the local patron or titular of the dedication.

[2] À Carpo, *loc. cit.*

[3] D. A., n. 2784, Sept. 1, 1838.

THE PRAYERS AFTER LOW MASS.

Qu. Kindly give a little explanation on the questions here proposed, and oblige a new but now constant reader of your excellent publication. If I mistake not, some two or three years ago the REVIEW was asked in what language the prayers after low Mass were to be recited, and answered that they were to be recited in the vernacular, and quoted a decision of the Sacred Congregation on the point, apparently settling the question. Now, I wish to ask when this decision was given, and if it was not for a particular case only? In the event of the decision being general, is it still the privilege of any bishop to order the recitation of these prayers in Latin only, and this throughout his whole diocese? Is it necessary for the gaining of the indulgences attached to these prayers for the people to recite the "Hail, holy Queen!" aloud with the priest?

When the bishop orders a commemoration to be made in the Mass, are there any limitations as to the length of time during which he may prescribe such a commemoration, or is it his privilege to have it continued as long as he may wish to have it done, even for over a year?

Resp. The rubric that accompanied the decree of the Sovereign Pontiff with regard to the saying of the prayers after every low Mass, stated that the prayers were to be recited *alternatim cum populo*, that is, the congregation is to respond and take part in the prayers. Since the faithful outside the Latin countries would as a rule be unable to answer the *Salve Regina*, and the *Ave Maria*, in Latin, the obvious sense of the rubric is that these prayers are to be said in the vulgar tongue. Such is actually the interpretation of the Roman periodical, *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, which replies to the question: "Qua lingua, h. e., utrum Latina aut vernacula (preces praedictae sunt recitandae)?" as follows, "Lingua vernacula alternatim cum populo adstante."[1]

The gaining of the indulgence does not depend on the recitation of the "Hail, holy Queen!" by the people aloud with the priest, because the term *alternately* (*alternatim*) does not specify the precise portions to be recited by priest or people, although custom has induced a certain method by which all join in the antiphon.

[1] *Cf.* AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Vol. I, p. 37.

As for the right of the Ordinary to establish a law of uniformity in regard to the recitation of these prayers there can hardly be any doubt. It must be presumed that where the bishop insists on the prayers being said in Latin the people are taught to answer in the same language and that they understand what they say.

The special prayers to be commemorated in the Mass under the name of *imperatae* are to be said until the order is revoked, unless the circumstances which called for them indicate their natural cessation. With the death or removal of the Ordinary the obligation ceases.

CONSECRATING AN ALTAR IN AN UNCONSECRATED CHURCH.

Qu. In the *Collectanea*, n. 832, p. 307, I find a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites stating that an altar cannot be consecrated in a church that is not consecrated. At the same time my attention is directed to a passage in Zitelli's *Apparatus Juris Ecclesiastici*, p. 464, which reads: "Posse autem consecrari altare etiam in Ecclesia tantummodo benedicta quin prius ipsa ecclesia consecretur declaravit Sac. Rit. Congr. in Molinen. 12 Sept. 1857." It is the same decree as is mentioned in the *Collectanea*.

May I impose on your kindness to settle the difficulty for me, as I wish to have our altar consecrated if permissible?

Resp. The reply to the *Dubium*[1] given in the *Collectanea*, is evidently a misprint. The *Negative* should read *Affirmative*. The older (French) edition of the *Collectanea* gives the decree correctly, as also the *Acta S. Sedis*.[2] If there were any doubt about the error in the *Collectanea* of the 1893 edition, it is removed by the publication of the last revision of the *Decreta Authentica* of the S. Congregation of Rites, which gives the same decision, *Affirmative*.

SENDING THE HOLY OILS BY "EXPRESS."

Our readers may recall a discussion in the REVIEW,[3] regarding the lawfulness of sending the Holy Oils by "express," in cases where the expense and other inconveniences make it very difficult

[1] Molinen. 12 Sept., 1857, n. 832.

[2] Vol. III, p. 592, n. 16.

[3] March, 1900, p. 311.